

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XIX

May • 1941

No. 4

New College Text

SINEWS OF PEACE, II

Bernard W. Dempsey

The Cultural
Approach

UTOPIAS AND THE HISTORIAN

Thomas P. Neill

Culturology
in a Tailspin

GREGORY VII -- TRIUMPHANT TODAY

Sister Mary Aquin

JESUIT NOTES

THE ENIGMA OF ROBESPIERRE

Eugene H. Korth

Book Reviews

THE LIBRARY AND THE HIGH SCHOOL

Sister Ann Loretto

A SYMPOSIUM ON ST. THOMAS

THE HISTORICAL THOMAS AQUINAS
.... Frank Sullivan

ST. THOMAS AND THE RECAPTURING
OF NATURAL WISDOM
.... Bernard J. Muller-Thym

ST. THOMAS AND THE TRANSFER
OF INTELLECTUAL SKILLS
.... Vernon J. Bourke

ACADEMIC FREEDOM Andrew C. Smith

Editorial Book Reviews

THE MODERN SCHOOLMAN... May 1941

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY, St. Louis, Mo.

\$1.00 yearly

Single copies 35 cents

(Separate copies of the bibliography 25 cents)

The publishers of *Philosophic Abstracts* take
pleasure in announcing for Summer 1941
publication

THE DICTIONARY of PHILOSOPHY

Although embraced in one volume, the dictionary covers metaphysics, ethics, epistemology, logic, philosophy of religion, esthetics, philosophy of law, philosophy of education, social philosophy and philosophical psychology. Special emphasis has been placed on the definition of basic concepts and terms germane to the contemporary schools of philosophy, logical positivism, dialectical materialism, mathematical logic, neo-scholasticism, philosophy of science, Chinese, Jewish and Indian philosophy.

The DICTIONARY OF PHILOSOPHY is edited by Dagobert D. Runes with the collaboration of Alonzo Church, Rudolf Carnap, G. Watts Cunningham, Edgar Sheffield Brightman, Irwin Edman, Rudolf Allers, A. C. Ewing, Ralph Tyler Flewelling, Jorgen Jorgensen, Ledger Wood, William Marias Malisoff, Carl G. Hempel, B. A. G. Fuller, A. Cornelius Benjamin, Hunter Guthrie, Wilbur Long, V. J. McGill, A. C. Pegis, Glenn R. Morrow, Joseph Ratner, Wendell T. Bush, Dorion Cairns, James K. Feibleman, Paul A. Schillp, Paul Weiss and a number of other scholars.

Applications for further literature, as well as
other communications, should be addressed to:

PHILOSOPHIC ABSTRACTS

15 EAST 40th STREET

NEW YORK CITY

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

Includes the following Schools and Colleges and Affiliated Institutions

CONSTITUENT SCHOOLS

College of Arts and Sciences.....	221 North Grand Blvd.
College of Arts and Sciences at Florissant.....	Florissant, Mo.
Graduate School.....	15 North Grand Blvd.
School of Divinity.....	St. Mary's College, St. Marys, Kansas
School of Medicine.....	1402 S. Grand Blvd.
School of Law.....	3642 Lindell Blvd.
School of Philosophy and Science.....	3633 West Pine
School of Dentistry.....	3556 Caroline Street
School of Commerce and Finance.....	3674 Lindell Blvd.
School of Education and Social Science.....	15 North Grand Blvd.
School of Nursing.....	1325 S. Grand Blvd.
School of Social Work.....	207 North Grand Blvd.

THE CORPORATE COLLEGES

Fontbonne College.....	Wydown and Big Bend Blvds.
Maryville College.....	Meramec and Nebraska Avenues
Webster College.....	Lockwood Blvd., Webster Groves, Missouri
Notre Dame Junior College.....	Ripa Avenue, South Saint Louis
Saint Mary's Junior College.....	O'Fallon, Missouri

THE HOSPITALS

1. UNIVERSITY HOSPITALS
 - (a) St. Mary's Hospital.....Clayton and Bellevue Avenues
 - (b) Firmin Desloge Hospital.....1325 South Grand Blvd.
 - (c) Mt. St. Rose Sanatorium.....9101 South Broadway
2. AFFILIATED HOSPITALS
 - (a) Alexian Brothers' Hospital.....3933 South Broadway
 - (b) St. Anthony's Hospital.....Grand Blvd. and Chippewa
 - (c) St. John's Hospital.....307 South Euclid Avenue

3. STAFF-RELATED HOSPITALS

- (a) St. Mary's Infirmary.....1536 Papin Street
- (b) St. Louis City Hospital, Unit I.....1515 Lafayette Ave.
- (c) Homer G. Phillips Hospital.....2601 Whittier
- (d) St. Louis City Sanitarium.....5300 Arsenal Street
- (e) St. Louis Isolation Hospital.....5600 Arsenal Street

AFFILIATED NURSING SCHOOLS

- (a) Alexian Brothers' Hospital School of Nursing—
3933 South Broadway
- (b) St. John's Hospital School of Nursing.....307 S. Euclid Ave.

THE OUT-PATIENT SERVICES

1. THE UNIVERSITY OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENT
Firmin Desloge Hospital.....1315 South Grand Boulevard
2. THE ASSOCIATED OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENTS
 - (a) Alexian Brothers' Dispensary.....3933 South Broadway
 - (b) St. John's Dispensary.....4945 Audubon Avenue

THE STAFF-RELATED OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENTS

- (a) City Dispensary.....1515 Lafayette Avenue
- (b) The Obstetric Dispensaries
St. Louis Obstetrical Hospital Association
St. Ann's Foundling Asylum
- (c) The Pre-Natal Clinics
The Cass Avenue Clinic
The Bethesda Dispensary

WHITE HOUSE

St. Louis House of Retreats—
White House, Jefferson Barracks P. O., Missouri

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY

for Teachers and Students of History

Published quarterly in November, January, March and May by the Missouri Province Educational Institute, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo. Price: 25c a copy; \$1.00 a year. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932, at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on January 20, 1933.

VOL. XIX

MAY, 1941

No. 4

Table of Contents

UTOPIAN LITERATURE AND THE HISTORIAN	THOMAS P. NEILL	75
GREGORY VII—TRIUMPHANT TODAY	SISTER MARY AQUIN	77
EDITORIALS		79
THE SINEWS OF PEACE, II	BERNARD W. DEMPSEY	81
THE ENIGMA OF ROBESPIERRE	EUGENE H. KORTH	83
JESUIT NOTES	RAYMOND CORRIGAN	85
THE LIBRARY AND THE HISTORY CLASS	SISTER ANN LORETTO	87
BOOK REVIEWS		91

THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN is indexed in the Catholic Magazine Index of *The Catholic Bookman* and *The Catholic Periodical Index*

Utopian Literature and the Historian

Thomas P. Neill, M. A.

St. Louis University

UNTIL quite recently historians regarded utopias as mere dreams of wishful thinkers deserving of no more than passing notice. They constituted the province of the student of literature, perhaps, or they fitted into the history of ideas, but they were not the concern of the political historian. As the scope of history widened to include the story of man's cultural and social past, the possibility of utilizing utopian literature as a prime source of information presented itself.

Admittedly utopias are dreams, but as dreams are constructed from the dreamer's various experiences, so utopias are built out of the materials of the age in which they were written. They help us, therefore, to understand the past; they furnish an immediate criticism of the age in which they were written, and they indicate what thoughts then disturbed men's minds, what opinions were in the air, what was taken for granted and what new ideas were the subject of debate.

As utopias help the historian to understand the past, so on the other hand can the historian help us to understand utopias. Unless one knows the Athens of Plato's day, the *Republic* will seem the arbitrary creation of an idle dreamer; unless one knows the England of the nineteenth century, he can never hope to understand Samuel Butler's *Erewhon*. Hence the historian's concern with utopian literature can render a double service, one to the historian's fuller understanding of the past and the other to the accepted interpretation of each utopia.

More than 350 works have been classified as utopian literature. More than half of these are satires, like Joseph Hall's *Mundus Alter et Idem* written in early Stuart England. Hall constructs an "ideal" world whose districts correspond to the leading weakness of his time.

In Yvronia, for example, it is a crime to leave your cup partly full, and any sober man who murders a drunkard must die of thirst. In Virginia, another district, no man may interpose a word when his wife launches into speech; neither may he deny her any ornament of dress she desires. Such famous works as Butler's *Erewhon* and Bulwer-Lytton's *Coming Race* are utopian satires, each of which creates an "ideal" world caricaturing the shortcomings of the age in which they were written.

Of the utopias proper, there are some thirty which present real reforms while criticizing society, and they are to be included on the "must" list for one who would become conversant with Utopian literature. Among the ancients, Plato's *Republic* stands in a pre-eminent place, while Plutarch's *Lycurgas* cannot be ignored. Most important of the early moderns are: More's *Utopia*. Campanella's *City of the Sun*, Bacon's *New Atlantis*, Andreae's *Christianopolis*, Gott's *Nova Solyma* and Harrington's *Oceana*. The eighteenth century is filled with romantic utopias and much talk of achieving an ideal society by mankind's conforming to the "natural law" then being discovered, but there is no outstanding work till the middle of the nineteenth century. Cabet's *Voyage to Icaria*, Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, Hertzka's *Freeland* and Morris' *News From Nowhere* top the others. Finally, in 1905 Wells wrote his *Modern Utopia*, which deserves to be ranked with those already mentioned.

Plato

The patriarch of all utopian literature is, of course, Plato's *Republic*, written almost four centuries before Christ. It was directed against the Sophists of his day and is put in dialogue form. Socrates meets the arguments of his young listeners, each of whom represents

a particular brand of Sophism, and by monopolizing the conversation, he creates an ideal republic. Frankly Socrates tells the young Athenians this is a make-believe state which exists nowhere on earth, though there might be a copy of it somewhere in heaven. It is an ideal toward which men should at all times strive. And utopias, all modeled on the *Republic*, remained ideals down till the nineteenth century; but then the laws of evolution were discovered and the optimistic Victorian believed he was taking such tremendous strides in mental and mechanical improvement that he would soon step into Utopia. Thus we have a new kind of utopian literature which reads like a weather report; from the present improvement there is no doubt that Utopia will be reached in the morning. H. G. Wells is quite sure his utopia is inevitable, for his last words are: "At last from dreams Utopias will have come to be working drawings, and the whole world will be shaping the final World State, the fair and great and fruitful World State, that will only not be a Utopia because it will be this world. So surely it must be . . ."

That is the one big difference between Plato's ideal world and Wells'. Plato dreamed, but he knew he was dreaming; Wells dreamed and fooled himself.

After Plato created his *Republic*, almost 2000 years elapse before the next ideal state takes form—More's *Utopia*—for in the intervening time Utopia was "up in the sky." Throughout the Middle Ages men knew of an ideal world to be reached after death; this life was to be taken as it was, for it was a stepping stone to the very real ideal life in heaven. There was little point in trying to bring heaven down to earth, for it could be reached by those who took the necessary means.

The Renaissance

But as the Middle Ages drew to a close and the modern era dawned, a number of events occurred to change man's perspective and center his attention on achieving what happiness he could on this earth. The crusades had been an expression of restlessness and adventure; Europeans made the acquaintance of new peoples, customs and institutions. Their vision was broadened and they began to dream of even more exotic places. Marco Polo wrote of his travels to Cathay in the fourteenth century and in imagination many a young man began to travel the world over. And then there occurred that general movement of mind and soul known as the Renaissance which encouraged man's accomplishing great things here and now. Most important of all, new worlds were discovered and expeditions fitted out to explore their tremendous and intriguing possibilities.

What men of the Renaissance hoped to accomplish is indicated in the utopian literature which these disturbed conditions evoked. These utopias are all located over the horizon, somewhere across the sea, each the ideal state of its author, and each a direct or implied criticism of its age. They are frankly impossible ideal worlds toward which men should strive, even though they can never be attained. As Thomas More said when he blotted the last line of *Utopia*, "There are many things in the Commonwealth of Utopia that I rather wish, than hope, to see followed in our government."

There is no doubt that More spoke with his tongue in his cheek; even so, he cleverly exonerates himself by

stating that he does not approve of everything in Utopia. Whether he wanted communal ownership of goods we can only guess; if he really wished tolerance in religion, he was far ahead of his age; if he wanted houses and cities so alike that "he who has seen one knows them all," he anticipated the modern factory town better than he could have known. But we do know that he wanted to correct the abuses of his England—as enclosures, a standing army, economic conditions which drive men to theft and robbery, an overly severe criminal code which punishes men harshly for those very things they are driven to do, the idle rich supported by laborers who must do the work of two and three men.

Andreae was more specific. He wished to abolish "popery" and to institute a thorough-going reform of education throughout the Germanies. Christianopolis is clearly the teacher's utopia. "Their instructors," he tells us, "are not men from the dregs of human society nor such as are useless for other occupations, but the choicest of all citizens, persons whose standing in the republic is known and who very often have access to the highest positions in the state." The latter half of the work reads like a college catalogue with almost half the book devoted to the curriculum.

Bacon exemplifies another current of Renaissance thought when he constructs the scientists' utopia. There are experimental laboratories under the earth, on the earth, and high in the sky. All the world is a laboratory in which learned men work constantly to discover "the knowledge of causes, and secret motions of things, and the enlarging of the bounds of human empire, to the effecting of all things possible."

The Modern Age

After this first burst of utopian literature, men wrote down only occasional dreams until the latter half of the nineteenth century. Then again a number of developments took place which made men "furiously to think" and seriously to believe that Utopia was not only attainable; it was also inevitable and inescapable.

The Industrial Revolution showed man what wonderful things he could do, for certainly he had mastered the universe. More important, however, Darwin had unlocked the key to the secret of Progress, and Spencer had applied it to mankind. Only the fittest survived, it seemed, and as time went on the world would be filled with better and better people. Men of the nineteenth century congratulated themselves for having discovered laws of eugenics (few of them had read Plato or Campanella), and by application of these laws a perfect society could be attained. So these people became quite satisfied and more than a little optimistic. After all, they were mentally and morally superior to any men who had lived before; they had conquered the physical world, and their children would undoubtedly reap the full harvest in that world just around the corner—Utopia.

A brief comparison of two late nineteenth-century utopias will indicate the value of such works to the modern historian who likes to term himself an advocate of the "sociological approach." In 1887 Edward Bellamy published *Looking Backward*; in 1889 Theodor Hertzka finished his *Freeland, A Social Anticipation*. Each of the

(Please turn to page eighty-eight)

Gregory VII--Triumphant Today

Sister Mary Aquin, I. H. M., M. A.

Marygrove College, Detroit

THERE is a civil ministry attached to the Papacy; individual Popes may lose the exercise of this power, but the power remains "as long as the Church, always ready to resume its influence over civil society, the moment Providence commands it or the misery of humanity arouses this beneficent power to action."¹ Anyone who realizes how different might be the head-lines today if the voice of the Holy Father had been heard at Versailles, is bound to see significance in this principle laid down by Don Tosti, the Benedictine biographer of Boniface VIII. It is the purpose of this paper to view as a whole the history of this civil ministry of the Roman Pontificate in order to show that we are witnessing today the Resurrection period of that power.

The principle involved is clear enough. First laid down by Gelasius I in his famous decretal letter *Duo Sunt*, it recognizes two great powers in the world, the spiritual and the temporal, each autonomous in its own sphere. Both hold authority from God, but since in the end, the Pontiff in whom resides the supreme spiritual power, is responsible even for the conduct of kings, his is the greater in dignity.² Let them work together, then, to bring about human prosperity by the preservation of order, and thereby help civil society to its last end, heaven. This is the ideal. The world, however, as we find it, is made up of men marred by the fall of Adam, and, therefore, the actual working out of the principle is not so easy. Between the realms of the purely spiritual and the purely temporal, there lies a disputed territory; moreover, mutual encroachments, on the part of ecclesiastics into the realm of the temporal, and on the part of the state into the realm of the spiritual, may tend to confuse the issue and to bring about a cleavage between principle and practice. The whole history of the case, it would seem, falls into three great periods with Gregory VII as the turning point.³

The Papacy Dominated by the Empire

During the period that followed Gregory the Great, the Bishop of Rome came to be the actual representative of the Roman *res publica* in Italy and the principal defense against the Lombards. Both papal correspondence and the *Liber Pontificalis* prove, that as the Byzantine authority dwindled in the West, a leadership in civil affairs was actually forced upon the Papacy. It is thus that Carlyle sums up the events of the eighth century.⁴ With the crowning of Charlemagne we enter a new period. The union of the two fundamental elements in the very early medieval culture, the barbarians and the Church, has been achieved. This result is practically a Church-State with a benevolent monarch at its head, a man who has almost a priestly conception of his responsibility as champion of the Church against her enemies,

whether they be without or within, in low places or high.⁵ Witness his letter to Leo III in which he urges strict observance of canon law, advising the Pope as if he were a school-boy.⁶

It would seem, then, that there was a price connected with this first attempt at a "grand Christian Commonwealth." Carlyle points out the reason. Under the necessity of delivering western Europe from the confusion that followed on the downfall of the ancient Empire and the influx of barbarians, the leaders of Christendom naturally emphasized the principle of obedience, and, therefore, the sacred character of the state. Though still holding the theory of the dual authority in society, they tended to let the state take the greater share. In fact Carlyle shows that in one man you may find the two opposed views: the one, that the temporal power is superior even in ecclesiastical matters; the other, that the Church is superior to the State, for even the king is under canon law, and is liable to excommunication and loss of royal power if he does not maintain justice. It is possible from the decretals and actions of the times to build up a proof for either side.⁷ Practically speaking, however, the Emperor was supreme. Dawson puts it thus: The Carolingian Church . . . was in fact the territorial church regularized and universalized to such a degree that the Papacy itself had been subordinated to its principles. Charlemagne . . . himself now stood at the apex of the ecclesiastical pyramid, and the Pope was under his control.⁸

The time that followed the dissolution of this Empire has been characterized as "perhaps the darkest in all known European history," and nowhere "darker than in Rome, where, for sixty years one family dominated, making and unmaking popes at pleasure."⁹ The Papacy reached, in the pontificates of John XII and Benedict IX, its very lowest stage in influence and prestige.

The effort to free the Papacy from the sinister influence of the Italian nobility led quite naturally to a new kind of subservience, to the new German emperors, the only hope of order in a chaotic age. When Otto I rebuilt the Empire on the foundations laid by Charlemagne, he followed his dangerous precedent of Church control. He freed the Church for a time, it is true, from the turbulent Romans, but he did so by the violation of Church canons. Hughes in summarizing the tenth century writes:

The German kings who took their place (i. e., that of the Carolingians) had all the freshness . . . and even the genius of Charlemagne himself. From 918 to 983, under Henry I, Otto I and Otto II, the Church in Germany had all the advantages, rare in that century, that came of a strong, purposeful government . . .

The menacing feature . . . was its integration in the new political unity. . . . The Church tended to be, more completely than elsewhere—for there was here no tradition of a free church—an instrument in the hands of the kings. . . . All the abuses and usurpation systematized by Charlemagne reappeared in tenth century Germany, part of the systematic royal protection and promotion of the interests of religion.¹⁰

⁵ Christopher Dawson, *Mediaeval Religion*, New York, Sheed and Ward, 1934, 18

⁶ Ep. X, Ed. Jaffe, *Bibl. Rerum Germ.*, IV

⁷ Carlyle, *op. cit.* I², 253 ff.

⁸ *Loc. cit.*

⁹ Philip Hughes, *A History of the Church*, New York, Sheed & Ward, 1935, II, 223

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, 243

¹ Don Louis Tosti, *History of Pope Boniface VIII*, New York, Samuel R. Leland, 1933, 20

² Ep. 1. Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte* . . . , No. 187

³ For a detailed chronological view of the continuity of this principle and its violation in practice see R. W. and A. J. Carlyle, *A History of Medieval Political Theory in the West*, I, II, IV

⁴ *Ibid.*, I², 288

The Turning Point

When Henry III, in February, 1049, named a third German to the Papacy, he inaugurated a new age, the age of Hildebrand. Bruno, Bishop of Toul, although chosen uncanonically, insisted on his election being ratified according to the canons, and with him, under the name of Leo IX, the reforming spirit ascended the papal throne. Hildebrand accompanied him to Rome and entered upon the long period of preparation for the great work of his pontificate, a beginning of the struggle for the spiritual independence of the Church that has had its reverberations even to our day.

The mighty struggle against the evils of lay investiture, forever linked with the name of Gregory VII, concerns us here only as evidence of a changed relation between the two powers, spiritual and temporal. The Gelasian tradition remains, but there is a new emphasis. The previous insistence on the divine authority of the State had led to usurpation and the virtual enslavement of the spiritual power. Men of spiritual vision began to think more of the other side of the principle, namely, that government is not a "natural" institution but a consequence of the Fall and is related to man's sinful ambition;¹¹ it is the authority itself that is *de divino iure*, and not its possession by a certain individual; in fact, even the ruler is bound by the purpose of government to maintain justice and righteousness; the spiritual power is superior to the temporal, is responsible for the preservation of order in society, and, therefore, must be obeyed even by kings.¹² This in principle is not a reversal, but in practice it meant a complete reversal; it would elevate the Pope above the emperor, even render the imperial dignity dependent on the authority of the Pope.

The excommunication of Henry IV and his dramatic demonstration at Canossa concretize this new stand of the Papacy and give the key-note for its increased prestige during the next two centuries. "*Imperator intra ecclesiam non supra ecclesiam est*," St. Ambrose admonished Valentinian II seven hundred years before;¹³ more solemn, and more far-reaching were Gregory's words in 1079:

Hearken, O Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, to the prayer of thy servant, . . . In thy place, and by thy favour, God has given me authority to bind and loose upon earth. Wherefore, filled with this confidence, for the honour and defence of the Church, in the name of God Almighty, by thy power and thy authority, I deprive Henry the king, . . . who with unheard of pride has risen against thy Church, of all authority in the kingdom of the Teutons and in Italy. I release all Christians from their oaths of fidelity sworn to him or that they shall swear to him. I forbid any person to do him any of the service due to kings. . . . I bind him with the chain of anathema. . . .¹⁴

Gregory, it is true, was to meet with disaster, to die a failure; but his act had shaken the whole Roman world; his influence had created a whole "school of canon lawyers, whose fundamental tenets regarded the paramount position of the Roman Pontiffs in the Universal Church";¹⁵ and his spirit lived on to animate the Popes that followed, even beyond the investiture settlement.¹⁶

The Papacy Supreme

Many authorities admit with Dawson that the Concordat of Worms was only a compromise, "a temporary truce which allowed the combatants to organize their forces before taking up the struggle again." It marked, however, an immense gain for the Papacy.

Henceforward there was no question as to the international unity of the Church or the supreme authority of the Holy See. . . . For the first time the unity of Christian Europe, which had been implicit in the earlier mediaeval development, found explicit recognition in an international organization that was really effective and genuinely international. . . . Even in political matters the Papacy came to exercise a kind of international authority, as the supreme court of appeal and source of justice.¹⁷ We can see this best exemplified in the Pontificate of Innocent III. He felt it his duty to "reform the world through the paramount power of the Church";¹⁸ and the world was looking to him to accomplish it. In expressing his position as Pontiff he used the sun and moon simile of Gregory VII, the superiority of the spiritual over the temporal.

Innocent, however, did not hold that the Papacy was supreme in temporal matters. He held the traditional view of the two powers, each supreme in its own sphere. As Hill puts it:

It was supremacy in the realm of religion and morality that Innocent III had in mind when he proclaimed the superiority of the papal to the royal or the imperial authority. . . . His motive was not, therefore, to merge the spiritual authority in the civil, nor the civil in the spiritual, but to subordinate the one to the other in such a manner as to guarantee the peace of the Church and the security of its head.¹⁹

What Innocent aimed at was a unified Christendom to be accomplished by the moral force of the Papacy. Mann's expression of this purpose shows that in Innocent we have a complete reversal of the Carolingian Church-State: ". . . regarding himself and seeing himself acknowledged as the father of the great Christian family, as the apex of the feudal government of Europe, and as the rock of the Christian faith, (he) had the thought of reforming and elevating all things in Christ."²⁰

That Innocent actually accomplished this, at least for a time, is evident. A study of his pontificate reveals him presiding over the Roman Curia with justice and moderation, solving moral problems sent to him from all over Europe; working incessantly to uphold the authority of the Empire and to preserve its unity; and after ten years of effort, subduing even the turbulent Romans, becoming in Rome what he was in the rest of Christendom, the lord and arbiter.

We have also the testimony of authority to the success that Innocent achieved. An historian of two or three generations later could say that if he had lived ten years longer he would have converted the whole world to the one Faith. A modern historian writes:

The transcendent genius of Innocent III is conspicuous not only in the changes which he wrought in the whole system of European politics, but still more in his successful mastery of all opposition from contemporary sovereigns. . . . At his death he left the Papacy the sole acknowledged centre towards which all states gravitated as the law of their existence; and what perhaps was more difficult to achieve, he rooted this conviction for centuries

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, 23

¹⁸ Horace K. Mann, *The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages*, St. Louis, Herder, 1925, XI, 59. The principal facts about the reign of Innocent were taken from this source.

¹⁹ *A History of European Diplomacy*, i, p. 318, quoted in Mann, XI, 63

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 63

(Please turn to page eighty-nine)

¹¹ Carlyle, *op. cit.*, II², 144

¹² "Grégoire VII," *Dict. de la théol. cath.*, X, 73. "Le Pape étant de Dieu et tenant la place de Dieu, tout est subordonné au Pape; c'est à lui d'enseigner, d'avertir, de punir, d'améliorer, de juger, de décider."

¹³ Hughes, *op. cit.*, 261

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Mann, VII, 2n.

¹⁶ Mann, VIII, 171 ff.

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
for Teachers and Students of History

RAYMOND CORRIGAN, *Editor*

Staff

CHARLES J. MEHOK	ROBERT W. LAMBECK
GEORGE M. PIEPER	EUGENE H. KORTH
PETER O. PRICE	URBAN J. KRAMER
EARL J. KURTH	FLOYD L. STANTON

Advisory Board

MARTIN J. HARNEY Boston College	FRANCIS S. BETTEN Marquette University
THOMAS F. MAHER Gonzaga University	W. PATRICK DONNELLY Spring Hill College
CHARLES H. METZGER West Baden College	PETER M. DUNNE University of San Francisco
	GERALD G. WALSH Fordham University

RAYMOND R. MCAULEY, *Business Manager*

Address communications to The Historical Bulletin, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

EDITORIALS

A College Text That Is Different

Before or shortly after the lector benevolus scans this page advance copies of a new history text will be in circulation. Father W. Eugene Shiels has completed his *Summary Text for College Classes*, and the Loyola University Press is confident that the book will sell on its merits. Those of us who have been passively moaning under an avalanche of unsatisfactory texts will be grateful to the author. A few of us have watched the book grow from trial mimeograph to lithoprint and then, through a critical refining process, to its finished form. All of us know our students need a text they can trust, a text that is complete, coherent, clear, and above all Catholic in scope, in outlook, in tone. With enthusiasm duly restrained we invite the reader to examine the book in the light of his practical experience in the classroom.

Father Shiels wrote the first draft of his lectures for his own freshmen. His purpose was to give them a maximum of knowledge, understanding and appreciation of what is still important and vital in the long story of our civilization. An enthusiastic teacher, he made the operation painless by making it interesting, and interesting by making the issues clear and definite. Success and fraternal encouragement prompted him to elaborate and revise each unit with an eye on the annual overturn of several thousands of Catholic students in need of help. If Father Shiels had any particular kind of teacher in mind, it was the teacher who wants to get results.

The market is flooded with college texts, attractive, encyclopedic and, up to a point, scholarly. Some of them are too bulky, some are positively dangerous, all of them are written from a secular angle. At Saint Louis University we have seven varieties, nearly five hundred volumes in all; and they are in the library, where they belong. A good teacher can point out the flaws in any book. But when a student buys a book, he should feel secure in the use of it. It is one thing to criticize *his* book, and it is quite another to train him to be critical in his wider reading, in which error is unavoidable. Father Shiels sends the freshman to the library, but he sends him there prepared to defend himself against the printed page. And this brings us to a final remark.

In mere bulk other books have more to offer, for a higher price of course. Father Shiels has faced a problem squarely. Deans, standardizing agencies and educationists with nothing else to do have been insisting on frequent use of the library. Veterans among us who contended that it was better pedagogy to demand thirty pages a week of study in a single text than two hundred pages of rapid reading are now in the helpless minority. The obvious solution of the practical difficulty is to give the student a compact text in which he can *study* the essential facts and get a few clear ideas. Then let him broaden his vision by ranging over a fairly large assignment of collateral *reading*. All this, and much more you will find in Father Shiels' Introduction. *Q.v.*

The Cultural Approach

Said Mr. Dooley nearly forty years ago, when "scientific" history was still in the saddle: "I know histhry isn't thtrue, Hinnessy, because it ain't like what I see ivry day in Halsted Sthreet. If any man comes along with a histhry iv Greece or Rome that'll show me th' people fightin', gettin' dhrunk, makin' love, gettin' married, owin' th' grocery man an' bein' without hard-coal, I'll believe they was a Greece or Rome, but not befure . . . histhry is a post-mortem examination. It tells ye what a counthry died iv. But I'd like to know what it lived iv." This bit of bar-room philosophy serves as a take-off to introduce Caroline F. Ware's Introduction to *The Cultural Approach to History* (Columbia University Press. 1940. \$3.50). The American Historical Association has accepted the challenge of Mr. Dooley.

When preparing their program for the Christmas meeting of 1939 the A. H. A. committee announced: "Emphasis is being put on the study of history from the standpoint of total culture, and three main topics are being treated: the technique of cultural analysis and synthesis, the cultural role of ideas, and cultural conflict and nationality groups." Most of us noticed that there were some fairly attractive numbers on the program. No one could have listened to the reading of all the papers without considerable powers of multilocation. Now, for the edification of the world at large the Association has pub-

lished a collection of formal papers and discussions, ably edited by Miss Ware. The appearance of the book is a minor event in the history of historiography. It will serve as a guide-post for those who follow the newest trend among historians.

The fashion of the moment is *cultural* history, and if you want to be in style, you have to make some pretense at being interested in the cultural approach. Carlton Hayes, for example, had an eye on the main current in the modern flood when he changed a single word in the title of his magnificent college text and added some very excellent surveys of art, literature, philosophy and religion. But this was only a remote bow in the direction of the latest vogue. Hayes is still among the aristocrats, penitent or impenitent; the cultural approach is all-inclusive, totalitarian, proletarian. It focuses attention "upon the subject studied in the total structure of the society." It seems to be taken for granted, even by the dictionaries, that everybody knows what a culture is. Apparently, it is that complex whole which includes ideas, institutions, values, everything that is characteristic of a given group at a given time. In any case, facts must be fitted into a sort of framework in relation to which they are to be interpreted.

The idea of culture seems to have been borrowed from Anthropology, to be further elaborated with the aid of Sociology and Psychology. It makes new demands upon the historian, but, even so, it is simplicity itself when compared with the "New History," which would force him to become a specialist in just about everything under the sun. The cultural approach is in the realm of the practical; it will not frighten the scholar who has only one life to live. And whatever else may be said, it is evidence of progress and vitality in the historical profession. It is more than this; it is born of a wholesome discontent with faulty procedure that led only to partial truth. And we are hoping that when the fair promise of this new enthusiasm fails the disillusioned historian will find himself one step nearer the meaning of history, which lies beyond any earthly culture.

Historiography has evolved through many forms. It has been mere story telling, apologetics on a grandiose scale, party defense, patriotic declamation, literary fluff. It has been past politics, past economics, past religion, philosophy, sociology. It has been written to entertain the reader, to glorify or to debunk a hero. A century ago, it became "scientific," "objective," "unbiased," *voraussetzungslos*. But always it has been an image of the time and conditions in which the writer lived. Always it has been "aristocratic" in the sense, at least, that the historian was the heir of a culture that had survived, the spokesman of a dominant class, the member of an elite group whose literacy, whose literary power perhaps, raised him above the daily grind of the common man. And even when he was conscious of the coloring in his very subjective vision and tried honestly to correct it, even when in his "scientific" fervor he was determined to "let the facts speak for themselves" he found the dumb and silent facts recorded in documents, monuments, relics, that were largely the creation of an aristocracy of the past. We know, of course, that it is the purpose of a course in historical method to remedy all the flaws

in the compound reflectors by means of which we see the past. But historians who have mastered the best technique from Mabillon to the École des Chartes are warning us against more and more subtle perils to the attainment of historical truth.

The cultural approach can be sound and stimulating. Coming to us, as it does, in a book with the benison of the A. H. A. it commands attention. If it makes us more critical of our unconscious assumptions, and if it opens new avenues from the side of a half-dozen new 'ologies that are called social sciences, we shall be gratefully docile. Now and then, a freak may throw a slight disturbance into the normally sane and wholesome atmosphere of an A. H. A. meeting. (The benevolent atheism of the declining James Harvey Robinson was, we hope, our all-time low.) But the historians are generally a well-balanced group. And so, we feel like applauding the life and alertness manifest in the new cultural approach. We are still much more interested in Shakespeare than in his audiences, more curious about Napoleon than about the unknown soldiers who worshipped him. But if psychology or sociology will help us to penetrate the depths below the surface events, movements and persons that crowd the pages of our old-line history books, if they provide new techniques to discover what is behind institutions, customs, ideas, emotions, beliefs, taboos and values, we shall follow them,—with our eyes wide open. Only let us not be led astray by mere verbiage. Too many faddists are stirring up intellectual dust to obscure for a dizzy and distracted world the elementary truth that man is and always has been a creature of God.

Culturology in a Tailspin

We have hazarded a qualified approval of the cultural approach to history. And now, merely a coincidence perhaps, the first and only book calling for editorial comment reveals "culturology" running wild. John M. Mecklin, a Dartmouth professor who is not an historian, has written *The Passing of the Saint, a Study of a Cultural Type* (University of Chicago Press. \$2.00). The small book contains so much poison that the reader may overlook its merits, if it has any. The title and the subtitle make one suspicious; the introductory chapter should make him fighting mad. The saints are the one group of supremely successful men and women in whom divine grace, free will at its best, and correct perspective cannot be measured by the "new" science nor by any other purely natural science. Human they are, to be sure, and consequently liable to be very much influenced by the "culture" of their time. But it is naive, not to say nonsensical to present the saints and, along with them, the Church, Christianity and Christ Our Lord Himself as mere "cultural phenomena." The professor is probably not conscious of his implied blasphemy, and he is so obsessed with his theory that he imagines his selected facts can be made to fit it. The saints, most of whom had a sense of humor, would smile at this capital example of culturology in a tailspin.

The professor may accuse us of being as far from understanding his own "cultural type" as he is from understanding the saints. At any rate, if the choice were

(Please turn to page eighty-five)

The Sinews of Peace, II

Bernard W. Dempsey, S. J., Ph. D.

St. Louis University

WE HAVE traced thus far the movement toward larger units in the realm of civil organization. Starting by way of antithesis from a totally different medieval notion, first France, then England, then Germany and Italy achieved the efficiencies of unity. The belated unification of Germany and Italy is not without relation to the early accomplishment in France and England. Ultimately, however, political unity was achieved; meanwhile, a kindred movement proceeded in the economic domain. To this we turn.

II

Economic Concentration

The trend in the economic sphere was identical to that in the political. You are familiar with it and we need not elaborate upon it. Large units are efficient in business as well as in politics, especially where they are controlled by strong hands at the top. The same spirit of aggressive competition that ruled in politics ruled in business and produced the same results. We thought and talked liberalism and competition; we acted combinations and monopoly.

In greater or less degree this result has appeared in every phase of business, not only in America but the world over. Production of goods has passed into fewer and fewer hands. What has become of the Wintons and Locomobiles and Stars and Dorts, Durants and Kissel Kars, the Stephens and Wills-St. Clairs, that used to grace our highways. Unless you are different from about 90% of the population the car you drive is a product of Ford, General Motors or Chrysler-Dodge. The Kissel Kar and the Paige have gone the way of Ireland, Scotland and Wales, of Burgundy and Aquitaine, of Naples and Savoy, of Saxony and Bavaria. They were absorbed into larger units. And the motor industry is not peculiar; in steel and steel products, meat packing and cigarettes, tires and electrical machinery, oleomargarine and sugar, agricultural implements and refrigerators and about 75 more products, between 40 and 50% of the output comes from four producers or less.

On April 29, 1938, the President of the United States sent a message to Congress which began:

Unhappy events abroad have retaught us two simple truths about the liberty of a democratic people. The first truth is that the liberty of a democracy is not safe if the people tolerate the growth of private power to a point where it becomes stronger than their democratic state itself. That in its essence is Fascism—ownership of government by an individual, by a group, or by any other controlling private power. . . . Among us today a concentration of private power without equal in history is growing. . . . Of all corporations reporting from every part of the nation, one-tenth of 1 per cent of them owned 52% of the assets of all of them; and to clinch the point: Of all corporations reporting, less than 5% of them owned 87% of all the assets of all of them. . . . Of all the corporations reporting from every part of the country one tenth of 1 per cent of them earned 50% of the net income of all of them; and to clinch the point: Of all manufacturing corporations reporting, less than 4% of them earned 84% of all the net profits of all of them.

This quotation from the words of the President is not intended to imply approval of his policies, nor are the figures he selects particularly apt to prove his point. If only 4% of the corporations earned almost 90% of the

profits, then there must be a very large number of little corporations, and if there are a lot of little corporations then 4% of all corporations might still be a large number of corporations. But the quotation is, nevertheless, some evidence of increasing concentration, and, what is more, the figures are clear evidence of official recognition of the fact and of the official intention to supply some form of government action.

This problem exists and is a real one and we approach it without any apparatus that leads to a solution. The tendency is strongly toward greater government action which is no solution. Big politics is worse than big business.

But the business men have no right to look down their noses at the politicians for the proposals of business men have been not a bit more helpful. The National Association of Manufacturers undertakes to represent big business and does so. Each year their Congress of American Business meets and states a platform which is then publicized at no small expense. In 1937 a series of pamphlets was published of which the first was entitled "The American Way." It begins with the true and significant words "Man cannot live alone. He must associate and deal with other men," and having thus enunciated the basic principle of association, goes on to preach emphatically and without reservation unrestrained individualism. Nowhere in the booklet is there indication that the economic individual becomes a social responsibility. Now liberalism or individualism is not a solution: that is the problem as the same pamphlet unwittingly indicates when it attributes the benefits of mass production to individualism. The government in the view of The National Association of Manufacturers is to act merely as an umpire; "when the government steps out of its normal role of umpire and intervenes," all manner of evils follows; so "when the government acts as umpire" everything flourishes. Yet this is the same individualism of which Pius XI said: "Economic affairs cannot be left to face competition alone. From this source have proceeded in the past all the errors of the 'individualistic' school. This school, ignorant and forgetful of the social and moral aspects of economic matters, teaches that the state should refrain in theory and practice from interfering therein because these possess in free competition and open markets a principle of self-direction better able to control them than any created intellect. Free competition. . . . however, cannot be the ruling principle of the economic world. This has been abundantly proved by the consequences that have followed from the free rein given to these dangerous individualistic ideals. Still less can this function be performed by the economic supremacy which within recent times has taken the place of free competition; for this is a vehement and headstrong power which needs to be curbed strongly and ruled with prudence." (Q.A.88)

I have tried to outline how two similar forces have been at work in both politics and economics, in government and business. The trend has been toward larger units,

larger states, larger business units. These larger units present advantages and make possible efficiencies but they have not been administered in such a way as to serve the purpose of both government and business, namely to enable the persons and groups with the nation to lead better lives. The individual person has become a mere means to the ends of business and of government. Our country, shielded by two oceans and endowed with matchless resources, until 1917, developed apart from the nationalistic and imperialistic intrigues of Europe. The military power of France and Germany, the naval power of England were interesting to read about but it meant little to us which held the upper hand. Now we are asked to take a permanent hand in the game; we are being asked to underwrite an old empire and to bet against a new one.

What this may mean in our external policy is a very large question. But we are in a position to do something about it within our own country. I shall try to explain what we can do at home.

III

Industrial Democracy at Home

Industries and nations are like human beings. A nation is not anything at all apart from the real human beings who make it up, and it is not surprising that the conditions for health in a society of nations are fundamentally the same as the conditions for a wholesome society of men.

A human being is first of all a complete person, and to that personality its own life and development and perfection are of absolute importance. Each person has a life to live and a soul to save, and nothing in the world and no combination of things in the world can outweigh those considerations. With those capacities for development go responsibilities, and a person will use the opportunities for development and perfection or in defect of that use will possess a warped and stunted personality. To each person he himself seems to be the axis around whom the world revolves. And in a subjective but real sense it could not be otherwise; he sees all things from his own point of view. The mind of each of us is an observatory, from which as from Greenwich all latitude and longitude is measured.

But by a providential paradox, this self-centered world is not a selfish one. For the very impulse to development and perfection creates a need in man for association with his own kind. The little man is born into a family, the elemental association whose stability is the basis for all other societies. And families by inevitable association form towns and cities to promote their interests. And when the little man grows up he enters into a permanent association of his own. And in his economic, social, recreational and religious life he forms innumerable groups for corporate action. And only in such a medium does he flourish.

Now the human person has not fared so well in modern society. A theory called liberalism became current in Europe in the period just after 1648; it has ruled the world ever since. Liberalism spoke in high terms of human liberty but performed poorly for human persons. Liberalism liked to deal with man in isolation; it distrusted associations of common men. There were to be

no lesser associations within the state for there was a magic force called competition, that somehow unexplained automatically produced the greatest good for the greatest number. The workings of this force were never clear, but faith in it was blind and deep. Keep men isolated, keep them selfish individuals, not responsible social persons and all will be well. Even the family as a stable association was suspect; let us have easy irresponsible marriage and easy irresponsible divorce. And most of all let us have none of these religious associations. Let man worship God in isolation. This last, of course, was especially important if confiscation of church property would balance a liberal budget as it often has.

Now liberalism did not work; liberalism could not work either in the economic field or the political. Liberalism in the economic field left the many at the mercy of the ruthless, and the theory of competition yielded to the fact of monopoly. Liberalism favored small business and a fair field for all; it fostered a brood of monopolies. And in the political sphere two things happened. Internally the liberal state, called upon to offset more and more the tragedies of liberal policy, gradually found itself not only controlling the lives of its people for imperial purposes but also assuming almost complete responsibility for its citizenry, insuring them against illness, old age, unemployment, and subsidizing irreligious education, shipbuilding, birth control clinics and mother's pensions. Externally the same thing happened in politics as in business; the nations pursuing the policy of liberal individualism absorbed the small units, and there emerged political giants like the monopolies in business. And the little man, that the liberal said would be all right if you let him alone, found his energies more and more pre-empted by the State, now spelled with a capital letter, which he had been taught was merely to let things be. "... Because on account of the evil of Individualism, as we called it, things have come to such a pass that the highly developed social life which once flourished in a variety of prosperous institutions organically linked with each other, has been damaged and all but ruined, leaving thus virtually only individuals and the state. Social life lost entirely its organic form. The state, which now was encumbered with all the burdens once borne by associations rendered extinct by it, was in consequence submerged and overwhelmed by an infinity of affairs and duties." (Q.A.78) Liberalism prepared the way for its extreme opposite in all countries where it operated and today in Germany we see that system, espoused by all modern States except our own, carried to its fulness and perfection.

Pius XI in his long and profound encyclical on the social order, in which he elaborates the remedies for the evils of liberalism says:

This accumulation of power, the characteristic note of the economic order, is a natural result of limitless free competition which permits the survival of those only who are strongest, which often means those who fight most relentlessly, who pay least heed to the dictates of conscience.

This concentration of power has led to a three-fold struggle for domination. First, there is the struggle for dictatorship in the economic sphere itself; then, the fierce battle to acquire control of the state, so that its resources and authority may be abused in the economic struggles. Finally, the clash between states themselves.

(Please turn to page eighty-six)

The Enigma of Robespierre

Eugene H. Korth, S. J.

St. Louis University

MUCH has been written in the past about the strange career of Maximilien Marie Isidore de Robespierre, and many are the views concerning him. And so, no doubt, it will continue to be in the years to come. For Robespierre is one of those enigmatic individuals whose character beggars scrutiny yet challenges accurate interpretation. That there is a definite problem intimately associated with his name, no one will deny. Why a man of such scant talent, with little of true genius in him should have risen to the heights to which he did is understandable enough when one considers his unique character, the circumstances surrounding his life, the singular spirit of the times; but the question concerning his real position and his real power in the state during the hectic years of the French Revolution, and more particularly during the Reign of Terror, is a question on which historians differ even today. That is the question Ralph Korngold has proposed to answer in his recent book.¹ Whether or not he has succeeded in his task is questionable. Whether any other writer will succeed in the future remains to be seen. It is no simple work to understand a man's character. To do so we needs must understand his inner self. And here, of a truth, we are treading on dangerous ground; for the spiritual has ever defied accurate interpretation.

The Fourth Estate and Fanaticism

Mr. Korngold writes well; what he says is interesting; but it is not new. His is simply a revised edition of a familiar theory — that of the well-known historian, Mathiez. For him, as for Mathiez, the solution to the Robespierre problem lies in what he terms the "fourth estate." That the fourth estate did play a prominent part in the career of "The Incorruptible" is quite clear. That it is the final, conclusive answer to the question must be denied. There was more to Robespierre and his political activity than what we might call the "apostolate of the masses". True, he did favor the economic and social advance of the proletariat; but he did not stop there. There was another all-powerful motive in the life of the man which dominated and influenced his entire public career. It is precisely this vital, determining factor which the author has overlooked in his presentation of the subject. The attention he gives to the religious element in the making of Robespierre the "dictator"² is practically nil; yet that element cannot, dare not be overlooked. Everything hinges on just that. For if Robespierre was anything, he was a religious fanatic. Fanaticism it was that drove him to the top; fanaticism spurred him on to the attainment of his ideal, it gave him an indefinable hold

over the common people of Paris, it lead him to leadership in the Jacobin Club, and it made him endorse the horrors of the Terror, albeit he did not approve of them and would just as willingly have used some other means had those means been available. But they were not and so . . .

By nature Robespierre was not meant to be a fanatic. There was in him none of that intense emotionalism so characteristic of the type. Nor was he gifted with the imaginative power, the physical enthusiasm, the infectious nervous energy of a zealot. His was a mind that revelled in the cold, hard, repelling analyses of stern logical reasoning, in the rigid formulae of law codes, and the dry procedure of legal debate. He thrived on regularity, so much so that whatever interfered with the even tenor of his life was calculated to upset and irritate him. But this much he did have in common with others of his make—he was singularly blessed with an unswerving tenacity of purpose that knew no defeat and recognized no odds, a tenacity that was ultimately to raise him to the very pinnacle of the Revolution.

He reached that pinnacle not by reason of his administrative ability (which was meagre enough), not because of his qualities for leadership (for he had none), but because of his creed. It was the creed which he had learned from Rousseau, and which can be summed up in the one single word, *Virtue*. From the day of his interview with the famed author of the *Contrat Social* at Ermenonville, "Virtue was his creed, and it may be that the greatest misfortunes were the result of that interview because he became Virtue's disciple."³ The strain of Virtue never left his life. It coloured his whole political outlook, it narrowed his range of vision, obscured his judgment of men, spurred him on despite difficulties, almost resulted in the establishment of a new religion,⁴ raised him to the dizzy heights of mob popularity, and contributed not a little to his final downfall and ruin. It is a trait in the man that we must continually bear in mind if we are to see him as he actually was. Thoroughly steeped in the dogmas of Rousseau, utterly convinced that they alone would succeed in regenerating France, and through France all mankind, led on by the force of the religious spirit within him, he was willing to work with unceasing energy until he saw those same principles and doctrines incorporated into the constitutions of the human race.

The Jacobin Element

In the course of his work, Mr. Korngold remarks: Even when advocating belief in a Supreme Being, he will give as one of his main reasons that it is socially useful. In fact, there are few examples of an idealist so entirely free from sentimentalism as Robespierre. That such a man should suddenly have turned into a fanatical terrorist either for the purpose of establishing an Utopia, or—as a recent biographer claims—of

¹ *Robespierre and the Fourth Estate*, Modern Age Books, New York, 1941, \$3.75. Mr. Korngold's approach to the problem is that of an admirer of Robespierre, yet withal his work is singularly free from any of the bias so characteristic of confirmed admirers. He is delightfully impartial and eminently fair, ready both to praise and to censure. There is action, and plenty of it, in his narrative; there is animation, intrigue, variety, rhetoric, and not a little of the dramatic. Under the urge of his facile pen the bloody days of the Revolution stand forth in new life and vigour.

² For an explanation of Robespierre on the basis of the dictator theory see James Eagan's *Maximilien Robespierre: Nationalist Dictator*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1938.

³ Louis Madelin, *Figures of the Revolution*, New York, The Macaulay Company, 1929, 213.

⁴ The Cult of the Supreme Being.

making men conform to his idea of virtue, is almost too absurd to merit discussion.⁵

Thus easily does the author dispose of a problem which has been puzzling historians for years, and in so doing he lays himself open to attack: for he proves by his own words that he has failed to understand fully the strange, idealistic mind that was Robespierre's, and, what is less excusable, that he has failed to realize the important role of the Jacobin Club in the whole setup of the French Revolution. Had he been careful enough to investigate the gradual evolution that took place within the Jacobin organization during the days preceding the Terror, he might not have written what he did. For, as modern research has pointed out, the Jacobins of '92 and '93 were far removed in spirit from the Jacobins of '89.⁶ During those early years of the Revolution a transformation had taken place within the Club which resulted in a small, radical minority gaining control. That minority was a group of fanatics bent on securing on earth the beatitude reserved for the blessed in heaven. It was they who were responsible for the continuance of the Terror.⁷ As Professor Brinton states: "You cannot have disagreement in heaven. When the Jacobin found he could not convert those who disagreed with him, he had to try and exterminate them."⁸ To such lengths did his "religious" spirit drive him. And so, "it seems likely that for a few months these ordinary men were possessed by a faith, a contagion, an unearthly aspiration."⁹ The world knows the bloody, shocking result of that faith. Surprising? "Surely there is nothing surprising if a study of the Jacobins forces us to the conclusion that man cannot live by bread alone." Of these men Robespierre was the leader. With them he rose to eminence; in his fall, they also found their end.

And So the Terror

That Robespierre was for a time the idol of the people of Paris is an established fact, and well does Mr. Korngold stress the point; but he disregards the main issue. Robespierre's very popularity was a source of danger. Drunk with the wine of popular acclaim and strong in the strength of Jacobin power, he suddenly found himself in a position to realize the ideal of his life: the establishment of the Republic of Virtue. And for once he acted with rapidity. Morals became the talk of Paris. Brothels were closed, prostitutes put to death, thousands imprisoned and condemned on the charge of "having depraved morals." The Terror increased in intensity. For he had come to the conclusion that for him the Terror was the sole means of achieving his great purpose. "Virtue, apart

from which terror is baneful; terror, apart from which virtue is powerless.' That was Robespierre's whole theory. Thus, the greater his longing to establish virtue, the fiercer did the Terror become under his sway."¹⁰

In that drive towards the establishment of the ideal republic, the Festival of the Supreme Being was the culminating event. As he stood on the colorful Champ de Mars that eventful day of the 20th Prairial, the Man of Virtue no doubt believed that at last he had secured his goal and his position was assured. Madelin remarks: For one moment this most prudent of men forgot his caution; his face usually grave, was brightened by a smile of triumph. For a moment the vicar of God fancied he was himself God!¹¹ And Belloc adds: "But a man that had known our Europe better than David would have concealed among these symbols, a figure of Laughter tiptoe, with the legs of a faun and pointed ears."¹² It was the prelude to the end.

It is, therefore, as a preacher of Virtue and not as a statesman or champion of the economically oppressed that Robespierre is best considered. He was never a leader of men, a ruler of nations; nor was he, as some would have it, the controlling genius in the Committee of Public Safety. At the most, he was the mouthpiece of the organization, its representative at the rostrum. It was not he who formulated the plans, issued the orders, or brought into being the machine that gave to chaotic France a semblance of order. Greater, more determined minds than his were the prime movers of the Committee's untiring activity. As someone has well written:

The reason why he is almost universally regarded as . . . the dominant spirit in the Committee is not hard to discover. Men like Carnot and Billaud-Varenne were not conspicuous speakers in the Convention, nor were they the idols of any section of the populace; but Robespierre had a fanatical following among the Jacobins, and was one of the most popular orators in the Convention, on which his carefully prepared addresses often made a deep impression . . . his pure life and admitted incorruptibility threw a lustre on the Committee of which he was a member, and his colleagues offered no opposition to his posing as their representative and reflecting some of his personal popularity upon them so long as he did not interfere with their work. Moreover, he alone never left Paris, whilst all the others, except Barère, were constantly engaged on missions to the armies . . . and the provinces.

Therein lies the great paradox of his career. Seemingly powerful, he never actually ruled supreme. He was, it is true, the high-priest of Virtue, the chaste Pontiff of the Supreme Being, the Man of Doctrine, the "Incorruptible" par excellence, the idol of the people, but in state affairs he was little more than a figurehead, a tool in the hands of far stronger men, a tool to be used as long as it was worth while and then discarded as a useless, worn-out instrument. Why he supported the reign of Terror has already been pointed out; why the Terror came to a close with his fall is well answered by these words of Hilaire Belloc:

Robespierre, being the popular idol, had become also the symbol of a popular frenzy which was supposed to be ruling the country. But that frenzy was not ruling the country. What was ruling the country was the Committee of Public Safety, in which Carnot's was the chief brain. . . . It was his popular position which made their policy possible. When he was destroyed they

⁵ *Robespierre and the Fourth Estate*, 93.

⁶ For a full explanation of this thesis, see Professor Crane Brinton's excellent book, *The Jacobins*, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1930.

⁷ Various explanations of the Terror have been offered. Aulard interpreted it as a military dictatorship caused by the pressure of internal and external strife. This thesis fails, however, to explain why the Terror continued after the danger of foreign invasion was no more. Mathiez attempted to prove it to be a premature dictatorship of the proletariat. He thus did away with the difficulty of chronology, but the explanation is merely theoretical. Cochin came nearest the truth by proposing the "pressure group" solution. He insists (and he has factual evidence on which to base his conclusions) that the Terror was essentially planned and deliberately prolonged by a very powerful minority of religious fanatics who tried to turn earth into heaven, and who resorted to force when men failed to fall in line with their way of thinking. This is the explanation Brinton has followed.

⁸ Brinton, *The Jacobins*, 239.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 240.

¹⁰ Madelin, *The French Revolution*, 404.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 407.

¹² Hilaire Belloc, *Robespierre*, New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1928, 335.

¹³ Belloc, *The French Revolution*, New York, Henry Holt & Company, 1911, 82, 83.

¹⁴ Madelin, *The French Revolution*, 382.

suddenly found that the Terror could no longer be maintained. Men had borne with it because of Robespierre, falsely imagining that Robespierre had desired it. Robespierre gone, men would not bear with it any more.¹³

To label him a genius would be a grave mistake; he did exhibit at times flashes of brilliancy, of superior talent, but they were only temporary and were never tinted with that special distinguishing mark which elevates men of rare ability above the common level. In his fanaticism he considered himself entrusted with the mission of establishing in the world the creed of Virtue and the worship of the Supreme Being.

As the incarnation of Virtue he held the truth, and this imbued him with a sort of grave serenity: that of a priest . . . He was an infallible pontiff, almost a prophet. "There was something of the Mahomet in the man," writes Thibaudeau, "and something of Cromwell."¹⁴

And like Cromwell, he, too, killed in the name of religion and of Virtue.

Jesuit Notes, (Continued)

Raymond Corrigan, S. J., Ph. D.

St. Louis University

The work of Canisius, Bellarmine and Suarez is familiar to all who have studied the great Catholic Reform. Biographies of each are easily available. But we must insist, these men did not stand alone. The pre-eminence they enjoy is one of degree only. To scores of others it would be difficult to assign the rank each deserves. But there was one role the Jesuits were called upon to play, early in the order of time and supremely important, yet not so well known to the average student. The great Council of Trent has a place all its own in the annals of the Church. And in the Council of Trent Jesuit influence was of vital importance. It is not too much to say that in no other equivalent period did they do so much to determine the direction of European thought and intellectual development. The Council settled problems of great moment. It clarified Catholic doctrine while it diagnosed diseased teachings and forever rejected the new errors of the Reformers. The Jesuits are frequently listed along with the Papacy and the Council of Trent as one of the three factors in the Catholic Reform. It is well to note that they were no small part of the Council itself.

The Society was just five years old when the Council met in 1545. Yet three of its members were chosen to act as papal theologians. One of them, Blessed Peter Faber, died on the way to Trent. The other two, Salmeron and Lainez did much of the preliminary preparing of definitions in the committee stage, and were the most prominent speakers on the floor at the general sessions. In the third period, Lainez, as General of the Society, sat among the prelates with a right to vote on all questions. In the discussion of the most essential points, Original Sin, Justification and Faith, both showed their ability as theologians. Lainez especially was deputed to draw up a digest of Protestant innovations in the theology of the Sacraments; it seems, too, that he actually formulated the canons on confession adopted by the fourteenth session. In the discussions on the Mass and Holy Orders Salmeron and Lainez were very much to the fore. In general they led and concluded all public discussion. Clear, sure and deep, Lainez in particular was opposed to

compromise in questions of discipline, Communion under two forms, for example, as well as in questions of doctrine. In the thorny tangle of divine right episcopal jurisdiction Lainez was the standard bearer of the papacy. He was, of course, running true to Jesuit form, and the charge of "papalism," of undue adulation of the Holy See, of being a tool of the pope, was, to say the least, indicative of his effective reasoning. All along the line, with perhaps one minor setback, the Jesuit stand was wholly orthodox, as is evidenced by the eternal dogmas of Trent, supplemented by the later dogmas of the Vatican Council.

There were other Jesuits also at Trent: Polanco, representing the pope, during the final period, Canisius, first appearing as a youth of twenty-six, but growing, as the Council dragged out its 18 years, in his unparalleled knowledge of conditions in Germany, and LeJay, delegated by the powerful Cardinal of Augsburg, and finally Covillon, sent by the leading Catholic prince of Germany, Albert V of Bavaria. Lainez, easily first in a group of able men, was kept at work in spite of ill health and urgent calls from other quarters because he was "worth three well men." When he and Salmeron had the floor, the time limit was usually suspended. Arguing on the Holy Eucharist, Lainez quoted thirty-six authors, and the word got around that he quoted no one whose works, often voluminous, he had not read *in toto*.

But theology was not the only preoccupation of the Jesuits. They preached in the cathedral, taught catechism to the children of Trent, organized general communions, in a word reformed the town. In the Council itself, their hardest work was hidden drudgery, recognized only through later research into the records. Among the people their modesty and humility matched their learning. Prelates from distant parts could observe both. The fame of the Society was carried back to prepare an opening and a welcome for other Jesuits. Ignatius had foreseen, had planned even this happy conquest of good will. His brilliant sons lodged with a stable-boy and slaved among the outcast of Trent, the while swaying the most august assembly in Christendom. The "stamp of Jesuit thought" was left on the Catholic Church. And incidentally, the Council of Trent served as a springboard, so to speak, which raised the Society high in popular favor. The Society used its new power to spread and apply the decrees of Trent, and one of its members, Cardinal Palavicini, wrote the best history of the Council, —best until more scholarly work has given the Jesuits greater credit.

Editorials

(Continued from page eighty)

forced upon us, we would rather take our social science from the benighted Middle Ages than trust to the modern mind, which is notoriously a closed mind, for guidance through the rarified atmosphere of sanctity. The saints will judge the world, including the professor, for whom they speak a foreign tongue. And if there is a "passing" of the saint, it is the passing of an unending procession. We are guessing, but by no means blindly, when we say there are as many saints in the present bewildered generation as there ever were in the "cultures" of the past.

Sinews of Peace

(Continued from page eighty-two)

This latter arises from two causes: Because the nations apply their power and political influence, regardless of circumstances, to promote the economic advantages of their citizens; and because, vice versa, economic forces and economic domination are used to decide political controversies between peoples.

You assuredly know, Venerable Brethren and Beloved Children, and you lament the ultimate consequences of this Individualistic spirit in economic affairs. Free competition is dead; economic dictatorship has taken its place.

Unbridled ambition for domination has succeeded the desire for gain; the whole economic life has become hard, cruel and relentless in a ghastly measure. Furthermore, the intermingling and scandalous confusing of the duties and offices of civil authority and of economics has produced crying evils and have gone so far as to degrade the majesty of the state. The state which should be the supreme arbiter, ruling in kingly fashion far above all party contention, intent only upon justice and the common good, has become instead a slave, bound over to the service of human passion and greed.

What then are the sinews of peace? The sinews of the body are the connecting tendons. They bring the parts together and transmit impulse from one to another. God put man in the world unable fitly to supply all his own needs. He is dependent upon others. Not all men are equipped with the same talents; by specialization and the division of labor the diverse talents are developed, and there is a greater product for both. Not all parts of the world have the same climate; different products flourish in different areas: not all parts of the globe have the same physical structure; different metals and other chemical compounds are distributed irregularly over the surface of the earth. No one place or people enjoys a monopoly of everything. God made man dependent upon his fellows for his proper development, and He designed the earth to emphasize that dependence. These multiple interdependences are the sinews of peace; when they are recognized and promoted, we have social and economic progress. There is more for everybody.

Now the events of 1648 were possible because individual men had lost sight of the fact that the things men have in common are more important than their differences. The facts of common creation and common redemption are much more real and profound than artificial likes and dislikes. Not only had these ideas been lost in a negative way, but positively erroneous ideas were substituted in their places—competition in the economic sphere and nationalism in the political sphere. Both are erroneous because they look upon men not as social persons with rights and responsibilities but as instruments toward an end.

The only solution for the problem with which we are faced lies in a retracing of our steps. To recognize that the principles of competition and nationalism lead to years like 1932 and to the waste of such resources as we do produce, and to re-establish association and responsibility as the first principles of social organization in both economics and politics is not a nine days task. But it will never be accomplished by an appeal to discredited slogans.

The significance of this to us Americans is overwhelming. We are about to be drawn or pushed into the European battle for empire and domination. We know that the system is false and hollow, that war brings victory to no one and disaster to all, that prosperity for

all depends upon the development of our obvious interdependences, the sinews of peace. If we proceed to take an active part in Europe's brawl, we must be prepared to say yes to two questions:

- 1) Having entered the conflict and achieved a victory, are we willing to stay in it and enforce the peace which France and England have shown their incapability to enforce?
- 2) Just as in 1917 we entered a war to end war and have known practically no peace since, are we prepared to establish a national socialism to end national socialism?

The answer to the first question may be postponed indefinitely, because, even though we may build up a big armament, conceivably we may not enter the war. The second question must be answered at once. The imperialist nations of Europe spare no one's rights at home or abroad in war time. The whole nation is commanded from above. We are in the unusual position of embarking in a wartime program while not at war. We can use the same methods of centralization that Europe has employed, or we can use this unusual situation to remedy the grave defect in our industrial system.

Competition never was an adequate first principle of economic organization, and war time shows clearly that it is not. We are now clamoring for cooperative effort to get our program in step. We are planning to avoid bottle-necks in one industry and over supply in another, to achieve maximum production for defense purposes because obviously that is the way to achieve it.

Now, if this kind of cooperative effort, this emphasis on co-ordination and interdependence of industrial groups, is the way to produce the maximum of war goods, why is it not the best way to produce peace goods? Pope Pius' XI plan for the reconstruction of the social order simply called for recognition of the facts that all forms of economic activity are interdependent, and that that interdependence of men should be recognized, and industrial self-government on that basis be fostered. Vocational groups actually exist, each group making a contribution to the social product and in return receiving in the form of income the product of all other groups. The functional union by which they do so is more real and more important than any division of men according to what they have or have not. The manner in which we approach the defense problem has sharply demonstrated what should have been obvious.

We can then either approach our defense production problem by imitating Europe and just adding our name to the list of combatants, or we can take a bold, sound, democratic step in practicing what we preach to our neighbors, the extension of democracy with our economic life. Labor will soon make a demand for such functional organization. Management has long approached it through the trade association.

This functional organization, besides placing our defense production on a democratic basis and saving us from infection from liberal nationalism, is important for what is to come. The nations may now be crying "All out." Win or lose when it is over, "All in" will be far more significant. We will need a social structure to aid us in exercising our long neglected sinews of peace.

The Library and the History Class

Sister Ann Loretto, C. S. J., M. A.
St. Frances de Sales, Denver

HISTORY is an intensely human study in which the students meet real characters. Children are hero worshippers and with proper guidance they may select for their cherished historic characters those who are the very apotheosis of loyalty, high mindedness and the spirit of sacrifice.

In history, as in literature, the pupil sees real conduct expressing itself in all the relationships that arise in actual life. The youth learns right from wrong not by definitions or rules but under the guidance of a teacher, sympathetic and understanding enough to give the child the proper observation of life itself.

To know is not necessarily to do. History does more than teach the right. It grips emotionally and thus tends to set off the springs of conduct. The price of treachery is not just set down in cold print. The overwhelming tragedy, for instance, of Arnold portrayed in his death makes an emotional appeal so intense in the mind of the student that it repels him from the act of a traitor. Fortitude, heroism, and loyalty to principle, when taught through the stories of the Pilgrims, the death of Wolfe, Valley Forge, or the signing of the Declaration of Independence, are accompanied by emotions that prompt actions in keeping with these virtues.

The teacher may stress the maladjustments in early society and the quickened progress that resulted from mutual regard for the rights of others. In learning how people have repressed personal impulses in the interests of harmonious social life, the child develops, in a measure, the power of social adjustment in his own life.

Patriotism must be regarded as a desire to perpetuate those principles of justice and humanity that control the life of a nation. Patriotism develops rational humility rather than overbearing audaciousness. In the genuine patriotism of Washington, Lincoln, and Lee, there is warmth and brotherliness. These American patriots never sang a hymn of hatred. Teachers must not fail to utilize the rich opportunities to develop patriotism that can be found in practically every history lesson.

Now all these helps for teachers should be supplied by the library. When the library functions as an institution for education, the librarian becomes a consultant, an adviser in self-education. In other words, he is a guide to and helper in the use of books. This adaptation of self to the needs of others requires that the librarian have the trained and experienced facility for finding and organizing material suited to the reader of history. "He should possess the personality, tact, sympathy, enthusiasm, and understanding of educational psychology comparable to that of the successful teacher" (Adult Education and the Library, XI (March, 1927), 8).

Regardless of the store of knowledge of the teacher of history, the school library is a real need both for teachers and students. The library is an aid in

- a) reorganizing material to suit the students' needs;
- b) a reenforcement of facts that have slipped into the haze of a busy mind;

- c) the locating of material to be used by the students; for a list of best references is useless when not attainable for immediate use by the student members of the class.

Supplementary needs in history stories, biographies, travel, explorations, patriotic songs, and literature bearing on the unit being taught, if not available when needed, will prove useless later. For instance, when a period in the history of Greece or Rome is being taught, the teacher wants the supplementary reading reserved in the library for the students who will need this particular reading. These matters can best be arranged by the teachers consulting beforehand with the librarian and allowing enough time to gather the needed material, and thus avoid the confusion of last minute appeals for historical material.

The teachers of history should be acquainted with the reference works which the library possesses in order to create a critical attitude and to stimulate independent judgment. This cannot be accomplished with any great success without extended collateral reading. Reading and more reading is absolutely necessary for both teachers and students of history. The students must get acquainted with books in order to give them practice in the application of assimilated knowledge. This wholesome attitude cannot be acquired without the use of the library. If the teacher wishes to create a lively interest in the subject and to establish a permanent, worthwhile taste for substantial historical reading, it will be necessary that the students be made acquainted with historical references.

The teacher of history must guard against giving the pupil cause to feel that his country has a monopoly of courage and wisdom. It is well to remind children that we had leaders but other countries also had their leaders; we had Washington, others had Cincinnatus; we had Nathan Hale, others had Regulus; we had Webster, others had Demosthenes; we had Paul Jones, others had Lord Nelson; we had Lawrence, others had Leonidas. Unless this is done, our pupils may assume occasionally a "holier-than-thou" attitude, which is un-American and unpatriotic.

When the teaching of American history is used merely to develop vainglory and pugnacity, the result is unethical. Avoid making history an instrument for propaganda. In history, as in all school activities, only truth should be permitted to inspire.

There are probably many methods of procedure on the part of teachers to make pupils acquainted with collateral reading in history. One may call for written reports which will necessitate the use of library reference books. Notebooks may be kept; informal talks given; historical sketches; reports may be written or delivered on famous historical figures or periods; the use of book lists, chronologically arranged, may be given pupils for selection in reading; the use of magazines and newspapers for current events proves advantageous.

None of the above methods can be successfully carried out without expenditure of time and energy on the part of the teacher of history in consultation with the librarian in order to make available the material for the use of the students. Such time, however, will be well spent and the aid thus given will be sincerely appreciated by the students later.

It has been well said that the old-time librarian was proud and complacent in his possession of books. The

present day librarian smiles at this barren conception and bases his pride on the number of books distributed and the number of readers enrolled. Above all, the librarian takes especial pride in the aid the library can give in making books a means of positive and cultural value to those who make use of the facilities of the library.

"The role of the librarian is a most significant one. She should be ready but not over anxious to assist; to be responsive, but not intrusive; to be suggestive but not insistent; to recommend books without forcing one's own literary tastes or standards upon others; while helping readers, to make them independent in the use of the library instead of causing them to rely upon someone else to do the work and use all the judgment for them, all of which requires a nice adjustment of balances" (A. E. Bostwick, *The Library and Society*).

The modern librarian must be more than a lover of books; he must be a missionary of books. It has been well said that the public library is the "community's intelligence service"; in that same sense the school library is the laboratory, the hub of the school. The high school student who has learned to use any library intelligently will know how to continue his education,—in college or out of it.

Utopian Literature

(Continued from page seventy-six)

authors is disturbed by the social dislocation caused by concentration of wealth in fewer and fewer hands; each simplifies all the world's problems into the single problem of capital versus labor. Each has a solution; Bellamy's is socialism; Hertzka's is free enterprise made even freer. Bellamy's ideal commonwealth is utopia for the laboring masses, with all businesses amalgamated into a single gigantic business, the corporation of the United States which hires all labor and runs all the wheels of industry. Hertzka's ideal commonwealth is utopia for the little business man who in the 80's was being absorbed by the large capitalist. In Freeland all capital is vested in the state and anyone who wants to start up a business need only show he has a good chance of succeeding to obtain funds from the state. Hertzka, then, makes it possible for every laborer to be a midget capitalist.

But the two men have much in common, as did capital and labor in their day. Both place undying faith in Progress and see their ideal commonwealths possible within a few years. Bellamy stated that his book "is intended, in all seriousness, as a forecast, in accordance with the principles of evolution, of the next stage in the industrial and social development of humanity. . . . The dawn of the new era is already near at hand, and . . . the full day will swiftly follow." In the last section of *Freeland* Hertzka tells his readers that the highlands of Equatorial Africa are waiting. "In order that 'Freeland' be realized as I have drawn it," he writes, "nothing more is required, therefore, than a sufficient number of vigorous men." And he goes on to proffer his leadership to these vigorous men.

Both men show themselves to have been strongly influenced by Marx, though each takes pains to repudiate the more revolutionary of his teachings. Both accept Marx's analysis of woman's position in bourgeois society

and both would make her independent of her husband—and completely dependent on the state. As a result, both believe women will select only the fittest of men for husbands and thus the race will constantly be improved. Bellamy's Puritan background in Boston prevented him from destroying religion, but Hertzka is Marxist in his attitude toward any after-life. Released from the sufferings of this world, Freelanders will have no need for the psychological escapism of religion.

A reading of both *Looking Backward* and *Freeland*, therefore, presents two pictures of the same object—the late nineteenth-century mind, filled with optimism and self-satisfaction, materialist and perfectibilist, worshipping Progress and seeing in the past only the road to the future. Both are modified anarchists, as were all respectable intellectuals of the late nineteenth century who saw man becoming so good that a state would be superfluous in time to come.

Despite these points of agreement, Bellamy and Hertzka represent two poles toward which the thought of that time had been driven. Hertzka is a classical economist, a follower of Ricardo and Malthus and Mill. He has only one change to make. He would place capital in the hands of society instead of in the hands of a few bankers; but the basis of his economic organization is absolute individual independence, unrestricted competition, complete freedom of contract between employer and employee. All actions are governed by self-interest, which works for the common good when each man can get his hands on all the capital he needs. Hertzka represents the professorial school of classical economists, men who organized society on paper and put implicit trust in the various "laws" of economics. These laws, Hertzka takes pains to point out, solve all problems so very nicely that the good life is inescapable.

Bellamy, on the other hand, is a man who thinks with his heart. He sees the slums and the misery created by the Industrial Revolution; he sees want in the midst of plenty—and he revolts by building a new order based on a real fraternity in which cooperation replaces competition and ushers in the good life.

A reading of these two books, better than a perusal of any number of sociological histories of the period, presents a defense of the capitalist order on the one hand and an attack on its very foundations on the other. Moreover, it shows how much the camps of laissez-faire economy and of socialism had in common. It shows Marx's influence even among those who repudiated his tenets, the degree to which faith had been withdrawn from religious creeds and placed in the so-called "incontrovertible truths of natural science" and the "inescapable laws of economics."

The Historian and Utopias

While utopias serve as indicators of the temper of the age in which they were written and as severe critics of its abuses, the historian must handle them cautiously. He cannot take them uncritically without having first assured himself that the author in question is a true representative of his age, that he is not a crank on certain subjects. Andreae, for example, tells us that when he thinks of women in Christianopolis: "I am disgusted with worldly women; for they are either superstitiously scrupu-

lous, or altogether dull, or they rudely scold, or they wrinkle their faces, or they revel wantonly; finally, they keep giving their husbands advice, and never in season; they never love them sincerely nor take care of them economically." When he tells us this, we must ask ourselves whether women of his time were such scamps or whether he had been embittered by failure to win some fair maiden's hand.

There is one other very real danger attendant upon reading utopias, and that is the difficulty of interpretation, of determining just what the author praises and what he condemns, for many are satires that soon get so involved that the reader begins to wonder what the author seeks to praise and what he condemns. Butler's *Erewhon* is outstanding among these satires. Warned on these points, however, the historian can read utopian literature with the expectation of forming a better estimate of that age in which each is written.

Generalizations are always dangerous things, but some few can be made of Utopian literature. In general, utopias stress the social side of man's nature and attack his tendency toward individualistic activity. As time goes on, utopian authors make their men more important and the state less omnipotent. Plato had no thought of the welfare of men, for that was taken care of when the state's welfare is sought. More admits that one of the prime objectives of his Utopia is to promote the temporal welfare of its citizens, but all life in Utopia is rigidly regimented. Freedom is given more attention in later utopias, but even H. G. Wells in 1905 limits the individual to doing what the state decides is for his and the general welfare.

Utopias have been produced in cycles corresponding to times when the European world was in ferment intellectually, socially, culturally and politically. Each seeks to solve the problems disturbing men's minds and to chart the course for the future. Each is an act of hope for the future and an act of faith in the author's principles, the enactment of which will insure the good life. Each is an act of faith also in the goodness of human nature and the possibility of reform.

There is an increasing tendency throughout utopian literature to make government less and less important. The early utopias were "totalitarian"; the latest of them are practically anarchistic, for they believe men will voluntarily accept reforms, and since compulsion is unnecessary there is no reason for a government. Though the state tends to wither away, society continues to be important in all utopias.

It should be remembered, too, that each utopia is the author's own concept of a perfect world. For you or for me, no one of them is utopian. Wells admits this and readily concedes that foolish men will not like his *Modern Utopia*. Wells' botanist friend much preferred this world to utopia, and I am inclined to agree with the botanist rather than with Wells.

One will not find utopia by reading utopian literature, but he can learn much of the age in which it was written—and he can do this in painless fashion, for in general utopian literature is entertaining and quite readable as long as the proposed reforms are not taken too seriously by the reader. Perhaps the sanest remark on modern

man's reaction to any utopia was made by Bulwer-Lytton's adventuring young American mining engineer who had been down in Vril-ya for over a week: "It would be, then, utterly impossible to deny that the state of existence among the Vril-ya is thus, as a whole, immeasurably more felicitous than that of super-terrestrial races (Vril-ya is in the bowels of the earth), and, realising the dreams of our most sanguine philanthropists, almost approaches to a poet's conception of some angelical order. And yet, if you would take a thousand of the best and most philosophical human beings you could find in London, Paris, Berlin, New York, or even Boston, and place them as citizens in this beatified community, my belief is, that in less than a year they would either die of *ennui*, or attempt some revolution by which they would militate against the good of the community, and be burnt into cinders at the request of the Tur."

Gregory VII

(Continued from page seventy-eight)

in the hearts of men, however opposite their moral or intellectual characters.²¹

This second and rather ideal synthesis of the two great powers for the good of the world, however, was destined not to last. If Innocent III represents the achievement of the dream of Gregory VII, the Papacy as a strong moral force welding Christendom into a unified whole, Boniface VIII, the Pontiff who stood astride the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, typifies the reaction against that civil ministry, and its subsequent defeat.

Renewed Conflict and Defeat

The thirteenth century had witnessed an increase of the spirit of nationalism, a centrifugal force that was bound to come into conflict with the Papacy. In the Pontificate of Boniface VIII this spirit was personified in Edward I of England and Philip the Fair of France. At war with each other and determined to make their own nations supreme, neither was inclined to limit his independence by any submission to spiritual control even if it be wielded by the supreme spiritual authority. The result was a war to the death between the civil ministry of the Papacy and the temporal power of the world. The details of the struggle are common knowledge—the ringing challenge of Boniface in the famous bulls *Clericis laicos* (1296) and *Unam sanctam* (1302); the retaliation by the two kings; the degeneration of the quarrel into an attack by the insolent Philip on the person of the Pope, the sacrilegious outrage of Anagni. Of principle concern to us is the shift in emphasis that took place in the theory of the relations between the two powers. Was it just a shift in ecclesiastical policy to meet altered circumstances?²² was it an evidence of the proud, imperious nature of Boniface? or was it just another natural over-emphasis as the result of conflict? Perhaps it was all three. At any rate, Boniface held the double-sword idea, namely, that the temporal sword also is in the Pope's hand.

²¹ Brewer in the preface to his edition of Giraldus Cambrensis; quoted by Mann, XI, 68n.

²² Don Tosti, *op. cit.*, 9

²³ *Dict. de la theol. cath.*, II, 127. Hagemann in this article says that the *De Summa* was in answer to Marsilio; but cf. the modern ed. of the *Defensor Pacis* by C. W. Previté-Orton, Cambridge University Press, 1928. He comments on arguments that are in answer to those of Augustinus Triumphus, 266n, 277n.

We can see this over-emphasis best, perhaps, in the period that followed Boniface. His theory summarized in the *De Summa Potestate Ecclesiastica* by Augustinus Triumphus,²³ the answering war-cry of modern political theory sounded by Marsilio of Padua in his *Defensor Pacis*—and then the long struggle to crush the power of the Papacy; this is the story of the inevitable reaction.

The steps follow easily through the pages of history. There was the weakening of the Papal authority by the long captivity at Avignon, the Great Schism of the West and the consequent struggle against the Conciliar Movement, which, in essence, was an effort to destroy the monarchical nature of the Church organization and to put in its place democratic theory and practice. There was the climax of two centuries of growing opposition in the great revolt of 1517, when hatred and anger at temporal usurpation, real or supposed, ended in a violent attack against the spiritual authority and swept whole sections of Europe from allegiance to Rome.

The opposition, however, had not spent itself; He made himself King and He must die—"we have no king but Caesar". (John 19.15). There followed the critical year of 1648 when in the Treaty of Westphalia, the Pope was excluded from the politics of Europe,²⁴ and finally that low point in 1870, when Pius IX was deprived of all temporal power and became Prisoner of the Vatican. The challenge hurled by Boniface VIII had been answered. It is the opinion of Don Tosti that Boniface so identified with himself the principles of the civil ministry of the Papacy that it died and was buried with him.²⁵ But it was over the body of Pius IX that the kingly power of the world exulted, hurling stones at his corpse as it passed through the streets of Rome, the city of his boasted authority.

Yet was this defeat, or death in Christ? To Pius IX had fallen the task of paying the last farthing for the priceless pearl of spiritual independence conceived by Gregory VII, the price that Paschal II must have visioned in that momentary renunciation in the Concordat of Sutri. Deprived of the last vestige of temporal jurisdiction, what was Pius IX's answer to the world? It was a solemn proclamation of his infallible spiritual authority. And to those who doubted that spiritual power alone was sufficient if God so willed, Leo XIII gave the answer. From his palace prison the force of this Pope's personality reached out to every corner of the world, reversing, within twenty-five years, the world's attitude of hostility.

The Papacy Triumphant Today

To our age belongs the glory of the answer to our question: was 1870 defeat, or death in Christ? The civil ministry of the Papacy, sentenced to death in Boniface VIII, crucified and buried in Pius IX, has seen a glorious resurrection in Pius XI. When Achille Ratti ascended the Pontifical throne, he brought with him, even as did Hildebrand, a splendid preparation for the task before him. A humble scholar, an accomplished diplomat, he knew every phase of the delicate problem that he hoped to solve. He took as his name Pius; as his motto, the peace of Christ in the reign of Christ. The very first act of his Pontificate was a gesture of peace. Breaking

the precedent of sixty years' standing, he gave his blessing *Urbi et Orbi* from the external balcony of St. Peter's. As the most significant act of his Pontificate, he inaugurated and carried on the negotiations ending in the famed Lateran Peace Pact of 1929, by which the Pope once again became a temporal ruler. By the creation of the Vatican State, the smallest state in the world, Pius XI as the Vicar of Christ, received just enough temporal power to guarantee the exercise of his spiritual sovereignty.

Close to the Pope of Peace throughout these momentous negotiations stood the Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Pacelli. A Roman, a diplomat, but above all a man of spiritual strength, he is admirably fitted, as the gloriously reigning Pontiff, to carry on the papal program, "Peace, the work of justice."

And so, to our age, there belongs also the fulfillment of the reform movement inaugurated by Gregory VII. After a struggle of centuries, the Papacy stands today a purified spiritual force with power and authority, ready to remedy the chaos of the world, if only it be given a chance. A temporal monarch and at the same time the supreme spiritual authority on earth, the Pope has the necessary qualifications as an arbiter, a judge; for is he not free from the faults of the secular powers? He is not an Avignonese Pope, levelling exorbitant taxes, and, therefore, an object of suspicion to oppressed masses; not a Renaissance Pope, rivalling secular princes in the efficiency of his war-machine: rather he is one of those Pontiffs visioned by Gregory when he began his losing fight to free the Papacy from the domination of the State and to make it an independent spiritual force; he is truly a spiritual Father with power to conciliate the contending forces of the world, and thus guide society to its last end along the paths of justice, righteousness, and peace.

Reappraisal of Washington

BERNHARD KNOLLENBERG, a legal practitioner who became librarian of Yale, is a member of the honorable company of gentlemen amateurs who have done a great deal of the best work in the field of American history since there has been such a subject.

His reappraisal of Washington* is a recapitulation of a much written subject. It is organized to give approximately equal emphasis to the main controversial events and episodes in the Revolutionary career of George Washington, and attempts to do what Mr. Knollenberg thinks is justice to persons who have usually suffered by contrast to the commander-in-chief. As might be expected, there is not much new knowledge to be found here, but there is much new and much revived interpretation in the book. The author's object was to determine for himself whether the congressmen and Generals Gates and Conway were really the scoundrels most secondary works make them out to be. His approach is best summarized in his own words:

During the past thirty years of the present century . . . historians and biographers made great progress toward correcting the misimpressions created by their predecessors. But their work has been largely undone in recent years by John C. Fitzpatrick, editor of the monumental Bicentennial Edition of the *Writings*

* *Washington and the Revolution, A Reappraisal; Gates, Conway and the Continental Congress*, by Bernhard Knollenberg. New York, Macmillan. 1940. pp. xvi + 269. \$3.00

²⁴ Raymond Corrigan, "Rise of Secularization," *Cath. Hist. Review*. XXV, 51

²⁵ *Op. cit.*, 19

of Washington [and author of numerous works on the subject, including the longest article in the *Dictionary of American Biography*.—M. S.] . . .

I have rejected the conventional view as to the unimpeachability of Washington's statements and, while giving weight to them, have taken pains to check their accuracy against all other available, contemporaneous evidence.

The technique adopted was to collate the chief secondary works on the subject of the villainies of Congress, Gates and Conway, and the super-human virtues of Washington, and then to check the prevailing views against the sources. This is a good method and leads to some interesting results, only a few of which may be described in this space.

Knollenberg casts grave doubt on the professional honor of Harvard president Jared Sparks who appears to have mutilated texts in order to preserve the demigod-like stature of his hero (in his *Writings of Washington*).

Further he points out that fourteen articles in the *Dictionary of American Biography* assume the existence of what is mistily described as the "Conway Cabal," the existence of which we know of only through Washington's own remarks; Knollenberg claims the "Cabal" to be nothing more than an alluring legend. Again, he has a particular quarrel with Fitzpatrick's sketch of Washington in *DAB*, which he charges, has undone most of the good Washingtonian scholarship of the century by its uncritical eulogizing. (This reviewer has it on highest authority that the editors of *DAB* softened the praise in Fitzpatrick's article as much as the writer would allow). Perhaps Mr. Knollenberg exaggerates the importance of the *DAB* article; the popular encyclopaedias and the various predigested biographies written in the popular tongue of the fourth estate will probably continue to be the most influential sources for most people.

In general the author's conclusions are that Congress, perhaps mediocre, was not "a set of damned scoundrels" (Rupert Hughes); that most of the secondary works in which Gates figures rely for Gatesiana on Wilkinson (who most certainly was a rascal) while Gates himself, from the sum of other sources, was a soldier and no back-biter; that Conway, definitely an impertinent fellow, was not a conspirator against his military chief.

Knollenberg, after subjecting Washington's testimony to the usual historical tests, finds Washington hypersensitive to criticism and determined to show himself always in the right. This led him to imply blameworthiness in subordinates in matters where he himself failed. Most historians have taken Washington's word for everything. Q.E.D. He credits Washington with great personal bravery, coolness in emergency, and a perfect devotion to duty, which kept him on the job twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, for eight years (rather a contrast to some of the enemy general officers). He finds enough to admire in these things without uncharitably building Washington to super-stature at the expense of the reputations of other men.

The author makes rather too much of some petty deceits of Washington with regard to land titles and treatment of his slaves. He also alleges a certain inhumanity in the treatment of soldiers by excessive flogging. If these incidents prove anything important, they prove only that Washington was thoroughly acclimated to the moral climate of the American eighteenth century.

This is the book of an advocate appearing against a great name in a cause for deification of that name. If readers will remember that fact they will find it an honest book, and, what is unfortunately more rare today, an intellectually exciting book. MARSHALL T. SMELSER.

Book Reviews

The Development of Religious Toleration in England, IV, by W. K. Jordan. Cambridge. Harvard University Press. 1940. pp. 499. \$5.00.

There was a time when Catholic Europe had a common religion, when heresy was a sin against God and a crime against the Christian community, when the heretic became such by formally making his own selection of what he would accept in the traditional teaching of the Church. Today Europe has no common religion, heresy and sin have lost their meaning and the sons of former heretics are clinging desperately to inherited fragments of the old Faith. Somewhere in the years between a transformation has taken place. The state supplanted the Church. Politics or business or social life claimed man's first allegiance. It made no difference what you believed, and even if it did, nobody had any right to interfere. The modern fashion is toleration; in an earlier period persecution was no less in harmony with the prevailing spirit.

On the side of persecution there was much fanaticism and barbarian cruelty, but also a clear sense of reality and of relative values. On the side of toleration there is understanding and humane feeling, conditioned by widespread uncertainty and muddled thinking. The history of toleration is the history of apostasy from the Church, from Christianity, from religion itself, the history of indifference and of an expanding secularism. Approval, enthusiastic or tempered, will depend upon one's scheme of values. Intolerance fails in Christian charity, though it may be only half-blind; toleration usually has too little regard for Christian truth.

Professor Jordan has given us an intensive study of toleration in a limited area. His fourth volume, like the three that preceded it, will be well received by historians. If his views and his sympathies are modern, he knows it. He also recognizes that there was once an organic Christianity, which Europe has lost, and that the ideas and ideals of the Middle Ages had a nobility of their own. But his personal prejudices are Erastian; for him the Elizabethan settlement was "magnificent," and Elizabeth was the model sovereign.

The book is largely a running commentary on the writings of some forty major defenders of persecuted sects and of numerous less important writers. This method of treatment brings the reader close to the thought of the time and imparts a tone of objectivity to the whole book. Interest centers in the pleading of minority groups for a fair deal. They appeal to Christian charity so long outraged by persecution, and with this we are in fullest sympathy. They also insist that, in spite of differences, truth must prevail in the end, though the endless divisions of Protestant teaching gives this contention a hollow ring. The major argument, however, is purely secular. Politics and business thrive in times of peace and suffer from religious discord. Religion has lost its vitality and is not worth fighting for. At least the lay mind has other things to think about, and the sects, and more specifically the dwindling Catholic Church, are no longer to be feared. Of those who pretended that the passing of the medieval organic concept might lead to a deeper individual piety and a sounder morality the author remarks quite correctly: "These were cold, wholly pragmatic, and essentially lay rationalizations with which men sought to fill the vacuum left in their souls and in their institutions by the disappearance of the medieval ideal of Christian unity before the historical necessity of religious toleration."

R. CORRIGAN.

Rival Ambassadors at the Court of Queen Mary, by E. Harris Harbison. Princeton University Press. 1940. pp. xii + 380. \$4.00.

Quite early in the pages of this volume the author makes the statement that "England was at best a second-rate power" and its prestige on the Continent in the sixteenth century was "something even less than second-rate." Even so the conflict that was in progress between the nationalism of France and the imperial universalism of the Emperor Charles V made it worth while for the leading powers of Europe to strive to win the support of an England that was "an object of contempt to intriguing foreign diplomats." The Emperor therefore sent to the court of Mary Tudor the wily Renard, while Henry of France chose as his

representative the practical and unimaginative de Noailles. This book is the history of the conflict between these two men.

In the words of an ambassador of the Elizabethan age both these men believed that whichever power gained the support of England would not only "trim his fellow's locks but shear him to the skin". De Noailles got off to a bad start and for the most part it was Renard who had the best of it throughout Mary's reign. Everything centered round the marriage of the Queen, and Renard's plan to see that she was firmly planted on the throne, "put in a marrying humour" and married to the right person, was the plan that succeeded. The mediaeval Anglo-French rivalry was consequently prolonged through the years 1553 to 1558, for it was not possible to look into the future and see the century and half of warfare that was to mark Anglo-Spanish relations from the Armada to the Seven Years War.

Since the sixteenth century was also the age of the Renaissance a certain degree of cynicism might be expected in dealing with religious issues. It is not surprising therefore to find Renard looking at the confiscated monastic estates as something to be used in the game of politics; for him moral and ethical considerations made way when diplomacy was in the air. "The loftiest issues of religion ought to be considered in preference to a mere question of church property," he remarked. De Noailles was no better, the victims of the Marian persecution being for him "pawns in a political chess game in which the stake was foreign domination of England."

The whole period is one in which there is still much room for research. The author himself plainly intimates as much and proves it by the use he makes of the Tyler transcripts of Imperial and Spanish material for the history of England, and by his comments on the criticism from Catholic and Protestant, Frenchman and Spaniard on the marriage of Philip and Mary. The research student who wishes to emulate Mr. Harbison however will have to possess that rare combination of patience and literary style which justifies the publisher's hope that "this book will be welcomed as a humane and artistic treatment of a fascinating episode in European history."

HERBERT H. COULSON.

Three Virginia Frontiers, by Thomas P. Abernethy.
Louisiana State University Press. 1940. pp. xiii + 96.
\$1.50.

We have here the fourth series of the Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History, sponsored by Louisiana State University. Professor Abernethy's subject is the democratizing influence of the frontier in American history, and he has chosen Virginia of the early years as representative of early frontier conditions in general. In the three lectures he presents studies of the frontier influence in the three successive frontiers of settlement in Virginia, "Tidewater", "Piedmont and the Valley", and "Kentucky". He traces the struggle between European institutions and frontier conditions, and draws the conclusion that the former to a very great extent offset the influence of the frontier. This, however, can scarcely be called a new discovery, since no one would maintain that the frontier alone had influence in forming American thought, particularly in the colonial period. The selection of a proving ground farther west would have been fairer if the frontier theory as conceived by its strongest advocates were to be really tested.

While the lectures, as the author tells us, do not purport to be a history of the Virginia frontier, they nevertheless give an excellent account of the various migrations through and beyond Virginia. The analysis of the many factors involved in determining the course that migration took is valuable and will be of assistance in any study of westward advance.

While it does not materially alter the book's thought and might be considered a rather small point, we may here take exception to Professor Abernethy's citation of "the difficulty of obtaining divorce" as an illustration of the "small concern for individual rights" on the early frontier.

J. R. DERRIG.

Jesuit Adventure in China: During the Reign of K'ang Hsi, by Eloise Talcott Hibbert. New York. Dutton. 1941. pp. x + 298, with six illustrations. \$5.00.

The title of the book is misleading. "K'ang Hsi" would be a more accurate title, since the four parts of the book deal successively with the antecedents of the Emperor, his ascent to the throne, his contacts with foreigners, and his old age. K'ang Hsi is eulogized to the extreme. It is hardly fitting to speak of him as of "...one who stood out from among others of his generation, not only in physical strength and dexterity but in mind and moral character as well". Or does the author expect us to believe that torturing one's best friends, and one's own children, and maintaining a harem, are true indications of moral greatness?

The author is not well acquainted with the Jesuits in China. Let us examine a few of the things said of Father Verbiest, who seems to be admired and praised, at least for his learning. "He used Flemish as a code or cypher, because it was completely unknown in the Orient". 'No Jesuit could write classical Chinese, so the Emperor himself touched up their writings'. Who was it that translated the whole of the Missal into Chinese and presented it to Pope Innocent XI? But the worst calumny against Fr. Verbiest is that at his death he "...remained ignorant of the censure which he and his companions had received for the very compromises they had been forced to make". The "Compromises" refer to the "Chinese Rites". Before Fr. Verbiest went to China, Pope Alexander VII had issued a brief, allowing the Chinese Rites to be tolerated, since at the time, these rites were not thought to be of a religious nature. Fr. Verbiest and his companions were never censured by any Pope. But why look for historical accuracy in a work which echoes "The Jesuit slogan: 'The end justifies the means'", which speaks of the "Sects of the Roman Catholic Church", and of "A missionary of the Order of the Propaganda Fide"? It is regrettable that the author, who seems to have harmless intentions, has given the enemies of the Jesuits more "reasons" for their enmity.

CHARLES A. ROBINSON.

Great Britain Under Protection, by Frederic Benham.

New York. Macmillan. 1941. pp. xvi + 271. \$2.50.

A History of French Commercial Policies, by F. A. Haight.

New York. Macmillan. 1941. pp. xvii + 285. \$2.50.

These companion volumes form the beginning of a series on commercial policy and tariff history sponsored by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and edited by Michael T. Florinsky of Columbia University, who writes a forward for each volume. Studies are promised on Italy by Prof. Einaudi of Turin and on Germany by Prof. Predohl of Kiel.

The books are similar in structure, surveying very briefly the historical policies of both nations, treating somewhat less briefly the events from the War to 1929 and considering the period since in some detail. The complex story is told simply and clearly, and both volumes are most instructive and useful. The story itself is of course a sordid one, and the net impression left by both books can be summed in a phrase applied by Benham to one episode, "The moral is that when one nation adopts economic policies opposed to international cooperation, other nations are very likely to do the same."

As chronicles of economic events of great political importance both books are valuable, summarizing as they do material not yet available in convenient form. In the matter of interpretation, they differ greatly; the French volume departs from the factual to moralize on the virtues of liberalism; the English volume however interrupts the narrative only to give little economic explanations which are excellent.

B. W. DEMPSEY.

The American Agricultural Press, 1819-1860, by Albert

Lowther Demaree. New York. Columbia University Press. 1941. pp. xx + 430. \$4.00.

It may be easily proved from the Fathers of the Church, and their teaching is in conformity not only with that of "the Philosopher" but of Plato also, not to mention inspired poets of Rome and Greece, that the cities are dens of iniquity whereas rural life still retains something of the blessedness of the Golden Age or of the innocent days of Paradise. The Fathers of the American nation concurred wholeheartedly in this view: Washington wrote that agriculture was the most healthy, the most useful, and the most noble employment of man; and Jefferson held that farmers were the "chosen people of God."

During the period covered by Dr. Demaree fully eighty percent of the population of this nation drew their sustenance from the soil. Our leading historians of today literally overlook this most numerous, most happy and most American section of what should in all truth be their proper field. Dust-storms swirling forth from Industry's volcanoes dimmed their vision and at the same time buried the rich old life deep as Pompeii. Our American agricultural age seems now as remote and ancient as the cities beneath the lava of Vesuvius.

There have not been wanting explorers recently who attempt to survey the entire range of this subject, but the present volume, with almost excessive modesty, insists that the agricultural press, and only a section of this, engages his attention. Perhaps he limits himself to such material as he knew would interest the general reader.

Dr. Demaree should receive particular commendation for having followed his inspiration of adding a Part Second to the general exposition of his subject. In this he presents a well-chosen

variety of selections of verbatim extracts from the leading agricultural periodicals of the times. The reader will here find himself carried back, not without a certain sense of amusement, to the sobriety of those "good old days."

L. J. KENNY.

Coronado's Quest, by A. Grove Day. Berkeley. University of California Press. 1940. pp. xvi + 418. \$2.50.

There are those who would say that the Coronado expedition of 1540-1542 was one great colossal failure; and on the surface of things it would seem that they are right. The very opposite, however, is the conclusion at which Mr. Day arrives in his stirring account of this greatest of Spanish ventures into the American Southwest. Fate dealt cruelly with Francisco Vazquez de Coronado, more cruelly, perchance, than he deserved. In two years of wearisome, discouraging searching for the mythical El Dorado of the North, he found nothing but the adobe huts of Cibola and the small, thatch-roofed dwellings of "rich" Quivira. Yet what he accomplished was stupendous, and it is doubtful if even a Cortés or a Pizarro could have done more. By his wanderings over more than four thousand miles of open plains, of mountainous country and burning desert sands, he gave to the world the knowledge of a vast hitherto unknown interior where dwelt strange Indian tribes and over whose broad rolling area roamed thundering herds of wild buffalo. The Grand Canyon and the Colorado River were discovered and explored, new peoples were contacted and the great overland routes from Mexico to the north were opened. Emphatically, the expedition was not a failure, unless, indeed, "to have blazed the path for future exploration and colonization, to have been the first to carry the cross into the vast, arid regions of the mighty Southwest is to be counted as failure." Coronado found no gold; what he did find was worth immeasurably more. The whole Southwest is the heir to his explorations.

The study is based on a mass of documentary evidence both contemporary and later, and is a commendable achievement of historical scholarship. The author has for the most part followed the lead of Sauer in his presentation of disputed questions, and consequently his treatment of Fray Marcos is rather severe. There is good reason for believing that the friar actually did view Cibola from afar.

Constituting the first biography of this famous Spanish conquistador, the work should prove of special value to all those interested in the early history of Spanish America. Especially helpful are the bibliography, chronology, and very excellent course map of the discoveries made by the Coronado expedition.

E. H. KORTH.

Pope Innocent III and His Times, by Joseph Clayton. Milwaukee. Bruce Publishing Co. 1940. pp. xvi + 204. \$2.25.

Fitting it is that the first popular biography of Pope Innocent III should be published in these eventful days of another eventful pontificate. Eventful is perhaps the best word to describe the eighteen years during which Lothario Conti directed the affairs of Christendom as Pope Innocent III. Mr. Clayton has telescoped the scene of twelfth century Europe in this brief, accurate, interesting life of one of the greatest popes of all times. The early life of Lothario Conti is treated very briefly. Lothario was a talented young Roman; he developed his talents at the two intellectual centers of Europe: Paris and Bologna. Trained in theology and skilled in canon law, at the age of thirty-eight he was unanimously elected to rule the Church of Christ. Then the work began!

In the reform of the papal court Innocent showed the Christian world that he was an energetic, capable, and just ruler. Countless cases were sent to Rome for settlement, and they were settled impartially. No exceptions were made even for the great Philip Augustus or for Alphonso of Leon in their marriage problems. After Innocent had with great difficulty put an end to the fierce feuds of the Roman factions, he looked out over the Christian world and resolved to establish universal peace in Christendom. Christendom as Innocent saw it is accurately, vividly described by the author. The pope had no Adolph in Germany, no Benito in Italy, but Frederick II and Otto of Brunswick were certainly far from being model sons of the Holy Father. John of England and Philip Augustus were continually causing trouble. Despite all the efforts of the pope, the Christian world would not stop warring, and the threat of Islam was ignored. In these times of war and heresy Innocent III displayed such ability and justice in his position as ruler of the Church that he has deservedly been numbered among the great statesmen of the world.

No brief summary of the deeds of Pope Innocent III can do him justice. His life should be known by all who are interested

in the history of Christendom and in the history of Europe in general. The present volume offers all an opportunity to become acquainted with one of the most interesting characters of history. It was written for the general reader rather than the scholar.

GEORGE M. PIEPER.

A History of American Foreign Policy (Second Revision), by John Holladay Latané and David W. Wainhouse. New York. The Odyssey Press. 1940. pp. xii + 1028. \$4.50.

This second revision of the *History of American Foreign Policy* brings the record of United States diplomacy down to September, 1939,—the opening of the Second World War. The first edition of this distinguished work of the late Professor Latané appeared in 1927. A revision and enlargement, planned by the author, was prevented by his untimely death. A first revision was published by David W. Wainhouse in 1934, while this second revision presents its readers with an interesting and exact account of the subsequent five years of international developments as they bear directly on our foreign policy. A third revision, in what we hope will be a permanently less troubled era, will surely be in demand.

This work in reality brings between a single pair of covers matter which could easily have been published in eight separate volumes, corresponding to the eight periods of our foreign policy as the authors conceive it. The work of condensation is admirably done, for it would be difficult to exaggerate the readability, the clarity, the interest, or the exactness of the abundantly documented information which characterize this history. It would be a valuable addition to any library not yet in possession of it, for both those professionally interested and those just intellectually curious can take up this book with true profit. Its genuine scholarship, exhaustive documentation, careful examination of sources do not in the least detract from its lucid, non-technical style. In reading each of the eight phases of American foreign relations, one is transported to that age or clime, whether it be colonial days, the Panama Canal Zone, the Far East, or modern Europe during the First World War, and lives through those periods in company with the principal actors of the events that then transpired. To the atmosphere created in each successive section is added a clear objectivity and an interesting insight into a host of characters—not all of whom are too well-known to the average student of American history. In addition to Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Jackson—one comes to know Hamilton, Jay, Adams, Clay, Seward, Sumner, McKinley, and many others of the past two generations.

The book is most attractive; a series of excellent maps follow the trend of expansion; a carefully written marginal index makes the finding of any incident a matter of moments. One element seems to be lacking; at least, were it present many readers would appreciate it. There seems to be no effort made at a summarization of trends or fixed policies, or any pointing out of clear departures from former aims or practices. A paragraph at the end of each chapter, or a brief chapter between the various sections, or, at least, an endeavor to recapitulate at the close of the book, would be a welcome and satisfying addition to the accurately cataloged multitude of events contained in this lengthy volume. Even as it is, however, one cannot read through this scholarly work without realizing that his education has been agreeably and substantially increased.

P. J. HOLLORAN.

Social Order, by Walter L. Willigan and John J. O'Connor. Longmans. 1941. pp. 703. \$3.00.

To analyze social legislation in the light of the principles laid down by the encyclicals is a difficult task. It calls for an understanding of the existing social problems and factors that contributed to bring them about, as well as a thorough knowledge of the principles of Christian sociology and economics. The authors of *Social Order* point to the evils arising from a growing concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a few which has characterized our American economy. They recognize the consequent enslavement of labor and the masses of the poor. But there seems to be an undue willingness to accept New Deal legislation as the happiest of solutions to the social problems and the most practical application of the principles of the encyclicals, as well as of the principles contained in "The Church and the Social Order," a statement issued on February 7, 1940, by the Administrative Board of the NCWC. It should never be forgotten that centralization of control in the hands of the Federal Government is quite as great, if not a greater, evil than control in the hands of private individuals. One is as threatening to democracy as the other. While the encyclical of Pius XI, *Quadragesimo Anno*, tells us of the obligation of the state toward

its underprivileged constituents, it is no less insistent when it says: "The true aim of all social activity should be to help the individual member of the social body but never to destroy or absorb it."

In his authoritative *Reorganization of the Social Economy*, Nell-Breuning gives a good analysis of the principle of subsidiarity. (Strangely enough, this excellent work is omitted from an otherwise fine bibliography.) The authors of Social Order have done more, it seems to me, than "point out what the government is doing." Their failure to indicate any of the dangers concomitant with the multiple social agencies under the control of the Federal Government is at least a tacit approval of an ever increasing centralization of power. There is much disagreement on the values of the social legislation enacted since 1933. Drs. Willigan and O'Connor have assembled the material for an evaluation, but the important part of the task—the analysis of the legislation and the activity on the basis of Catholic philosophical principles—is still to be done.

A. H. SCHELLER.

Zachary Taylor: Soldier of the Republic, by Holman Hamilton. New York. Bobbs-Merrill. 1941. pp. xviii + 335. \$3.50.

"Old Rough and Ready" was indeed a soldier of the Republic. For almost forty years, in places as far apart as Minnesota and Florida, Indiana and Mexico, he served in the armed forces of the United States.

Many legends have grown up around "the hero of Buena Vista," not least among them stories of his rise from log cabin to White House. Much of this is due to the fact that he has long been neglected by competent biographers. The present is an attempt to reach a more soundly historical appraisal of Zachary Taylor, and the author has succeeded to a commendable degree. There are occasions, however, when he has allowed his enthusiasm for his subject to become too apparent.

This volume, which covers the period before Taylor became president, is to be followed by a second, dealing with his term as chief executive. It is written in a graphic style, entertaining enough to interest the casual reader; it is documented and annotated sufficiently to satisfy the scholar.

MARTIN HASTING.

The World of Nations, by Solomon F. Bloom. New York. Columbia University Press. 1940. pp. 225. \$2.50.

Amid the jumbled and frightening crash of older ideas and values it requires little effort to bring Nationalism and Socialism into a single composite picture. Nazi Germany has borrowed heavily from the Marxians, while Soviet Russia grows ominously more nationalist. Yet the Marxians divided society along horizontal lines; their contempt for the bourgeois state was a repudiation of national ideals; their world fraternity and their class-struggle gospel would sweep away national frontiers. The preaching of Marx seems to imply the incompatibility of two dynamic forces. But Marx was a realist, and his huge philosophy of hate evolved during two decades when Nationalism was clearly in the ascendant. One is curious to know his real attitude toward the nations.

There is no startling revelation in Professor Bloom's book. We are not surprised to learn that the founder of the First International reckoned with peoples of diverse character and culture. But the study was well worth doing. What the great revolutionist thought about English, French, German, Russian or other minor varieties of bourgeois and proletarian humanity is of considerable interest, at least to the historian. In his utopian plans for a classless society he did not dream of a nationless society. The workers, of course, must govern eventually. But he was content to let the bourgeois, especially in the Germany of 1848, prepare the way for the kingdom of Marx. He distinguished between "generic" man, who was forever the same, and "historical" human nature, which might vary from land to land. Professor Bloom has shown us the mind of the father of Dialectic Materialism as it is reflected in his letters, newspaper articles and minor works.

R. CORRIGAN.

The United States and Japan's New Order, by William C. Johnstone. New York. Oxford University Press. 1941. pp. x + 392. \$3.00.

Introducing his work with an account of American commercial, industrial, and missionary activity in China from 1794 to the present day, the author proceeds to show the effects of Japan's "New Order in East Asia" upon the institutions and

rights acquired by Americans during these years. Years of study and personal experience of American problems in the Far East give Professor Johnstone a command of all the leading facts and documents pertaining to his problem, and he is careful to outline rights of extraterritoriality, shipping, and inland navigation before he points out specific instances of Japanese infringement upon these rights. The result is a fairly clear picture of the conflict between American interests in China and Japanese imperialism. A lengthy appendix and an excellent bibliographical note make this an exceptionally useful book for the student of Oriental affairs and American foreign policy.

The primary reason for American fears in regard to China is that Japanese success will mean the end of equal opportunity for American commercial and industrial interests in China. American exports to China have never constituted more than three and one-half percent of our total export trade, but the possibility of our losing the bulk of our European markets has made the exports to China of greater importance than heretofore. The author recommends a more aggressive foreign policy for the United States and, as a necessary prerequisite, the moulding of American public opinion against Japanese imperialism. With the memory of our recent mistakes in China so easily recalled, it is difficult to see how the United States can successfully deal with the Japanese in China, and for this reason the recommendations of the author will most likely go unheeded.

J. HANLEY.

Discussion of Holidays in the Later Middle Ages, by Edith Cooperrider Rodgers. New York. Columbia University Press. 1940. pp. 147. \$1.50.

This contribution to the study of medieval life will be welcomed by students of medieval history. It presents a true and accurate picture of the problems which the multiplication of church festivals brought to the various classes of society: clerics, students and their masters, traders, and artisans.

After the introduction, in which the problem is clearly stated, the book is divided into four logical and well developed sections: The Theory of Orthodox Holiday Observance, Protests Against the Non-Observance of Holidays, Objections raised to the Observance of Holidays, Pre-Reformation Attempts to Correct Holiday Evils. Each part is illustrated with precise examples which make the work interesting as well as scholarly. The period under consideration is roughly that which begins with the thirteenth century and ends with the reformation.

The author is to be commended on her scholarly use of documentary sources. The abundance of footnotes makes it possible for the student who is seeking further information on any particular aspect of the holy day question to find the source on which the author has based that particular statement. The extensive bibliography and detailed index make this work one of particular value for the research student.

E. J. KURTH.

Western America: The Exploration, Settlement, and Development of the Region Beyond the Mississippi, by Leroy R. Hafen and Carl Coke Rister. New York. Prentice-Hall. 1941. pp. xxiv + 698. \$4.65.

The North, the South, the East, and New England have all had their historians, and in abundance; but poor Western America has long remained something of a neglected child of the American family. Not that Western history has been neglected! Since the days of Turner the West has had its devotees, its chroniclers, and its specialists. But the West as a whole has been unfortunate in having had too few capable interpreters, writers who, while recording the vast and romantic sweep of its history, have been able to offer a sympathetic and intelligent appraisal of its deeper significance. To join the ranks, by no means overcrowded, of such historiographical pioneers now come Doctors Hafen and Rister. Out of the pages of their *Western America* the Trans-Mississippi emerges as a section, with all the distinctive notes and characteristics, virtues and defects, material and cultural contributions, which we have tended to associate only with the more highly publicized regions of our United States.

The authors have, and with true historical perspicacity, prefaced the usual theme of Turner's "Significance of the Frontier" with considerations inspired by Bolton's "Significance of the Borderlands." The result, after due account has been taken of other non-Anglo-American factors of the national period, is a balanced and understandable interpretation. They have thus succeeded in segregating one of the most, if not the most, marked characteristic of Western America, namely, the fact that its culture is far more complex and correspondingly more rich than that engendered by the simpler clash of the Atlantic seaboard with frontier environment. If a general criticism is to be passed on the work, it would come largely to this: the authors seem to rely a bit over-

much on the ability of the reader to reach this important conclusion by means of the general impression to be created by their story. Perhaps, it might have been wiser to underline and emphasize specific facts and factors a bit more, in order that the conclusion might not be missed. And yet, we readily admit, they could have defeated their purpose by too much insistence; possibly, we should admire, rather than quarrel with, their moderation. At all events, they have rendered Western America a real service and written a document worthy of its greatness.

For abundance of factual material, collected and digested between two covers, the present work deserves to take its place at the head of the list of general studies of the frontier. Its chapter-end bibliographies, besides recalling the usual standard works, render the further service of listing a number of the best articles from the historical journals, studies which have the habit of escaping attention and further record. Designed as a textbook, the volume achieves that rather rare distinction, in works of this type, of being interesting reading.

JOHN F. BANNON.

The Kaw, The Heart of a Nation (The Rivers of America Series), by Floyd Benjamin Streeter. New York. Farrar and Rinehart. 1941. pp. x + 371. \$2.50.

Kansas is a state of very respectable dimensions; its acreage surpasses not only that of old England, but that of our six New England states combined, with half a dozen Delawares thrown in for good measure. The exact central spot of the continental United States is in Kansas, near Junction City on the river which carries the name Kansas on our school-maps but which is better known locally as the Kaw. Kansas lays no claim, at least not as yet, to being the Hub of the Universe, but the title "Heart of a Nation" is fairly justified.

A far greater amount of important American history than is recorded by our Atlantic and even our Pacific scribes has been enacted in Kansas and particularly there in the valley of the Kaw. The present volume makes no pretense at exhausting that history nor even at summarizing it. Those of us who know little of Kansas but who hold in high admiration some of the truly great men, magnificent Christian giants, whose charity and humility concealed them as they wandered amid the tepees and sod-huts that of old dotted the valley of the Kaw, might be inclined to blame the author for failing to discover these richest treasures in his own field: men like Gaillard, Ponziglione and Miège, who first carried the full light of the old Roman civilization as well as the glory of the invincible faith into those regions. But such condemnation would be founded on a misconception of the purpose of the book. Each volume of the River Series emphasizes the thing for which its section is noted. "The Kaw" is the farm volume, and it stresses the story of wheat, cattle and railroads. It is very much to the credit of the author that he has succeeded in vivifying these topics; he has done so, powerfully.

Dr. Streeter's "Prairie Trails and Cow Towns" issued in 1936, is already supplying abundant incidental material to the recent story writers of western pioneer days. Research students in these fields, and even biographers of such characters as the missionaries named above will want these books. The latter will, with such aids, be able to heighten the brilliance of those noble lives against the dark Rembrandt-like background of early Kansas life and strife, the realities, that the author has collected so assiduously, so plentifully and so accurately.

L. J. KENNY.

Fifty Years of War and Diplomacy in the Balkans: Pashich and the Union of the Yugoslavs, by Count Carlo Sforza. New York. Columbia University Press. 1940. pp. x + 195. \$2.75.

As this review is written, the Balkans occupy a position front and center on the stage in World War II. The situation is not a new one; Balkan countries have long been indicators of the state of European affairs, gauging the strength and weaknesses of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, measuring the influence of the Turk, and above all, manifesting the tenseness of pre-war Europe and occasioning the plunge into actual warfare. *Fifty Years of War and Diplomacy in the Balkans* has added interest from the present importance of the Balkan countries, giving as it does, the background of the present action, the struggle of the South Slavs for independence and the emergence of the state of Yugoslavia.

Count Sforza's book is really an account of the work of Nicholas Pashich during the half century of his remarkable career. Nor is the book's title misleading, for seemingly Pashich and Balkan diplomacy are practically synonymous, since he figured prominently in all state affairs from the time of his election as Deputy in 1878 to his death in 1926 while Premier of

Yugoslavia. During those fifty years, Pashich worked tirelessly for his ideal of union and independence for the south Slavs. All his efforts in the political and diplomatic posts which he held, Deputy and Premier of Serbia, representative of that country in two foreign capitals, and finally Premier of Yugoslavia, were directed to this end. Twice he became an exile and once he was under sentence of death for his political "crimes." The formation, in 1918, of Yugoslavia, the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, was at least the partial fulfillment of his ideal, but his work was not ended for ten more years.

The picture of Pashich which Count Sforza draws is of heroic proportions perhaps, with virtues painted bright, and less desirable qualities overshadowed, but the reader can obtain from it an accurate and valuable knowledge of the details of Balkan history for this period. Sforza writes from first-hand information and a knowledge of Balkan affairs gained from years of study during his own diplomatic career. One defect in the book is the presupposition of the reader's knowledge of facts and events to which the author refers in detailing particulars of history. In his foreword letter to President Butler, Sforza admits this defect, but the admission is no remedy—the defect remains. The chronological tables of sovereigns and treaties are useful in following the course of the narrative.

J. R. DERRIG.

Benedictine Monasticism as Reflected in the Warnefrid-Hildemar Commentaries on the Rule, by Sister M. Alfred Schroll, O. S. B. New York. Columbia University Press. 1941. pp. 217. \$2.75.

The intellectual awakening of Europe in the ninth century, the Carolingian renaissance, was made possible by the work of the men who had preserved the heritage of Greece and Rome during the barbarian invasions. These men were the monks of the West, the sons of Saint Benedict of Nursia. Inspired by the principles of the Benedictine Rule countless monks went forth to convert and to civilize the barbarian people of Europe. Courageously they set to work to reclaim vast wastes of the continent, and under their direction the important work of colonization was furthered. In brief, the names of the monks of the West are intimately bound with the conversion, civilization, education, and scholarship of western civilization. The monk Augustine labored in England, Boniface in Germany, Ansgar in Scandinavia, Willibrord in the Netherlands.

Since the influence of the monks in the development of medieval Europe is well known, many a person has wondered just what went on behind the walls of a medieval monastery. That scene of daily monastic life has been reconstructed in a scholarly, interesting way by Sister Mary Alfred. The present work presents a picture of monasticism in the eighth and ninth centuries as it is reflected in the first two commentaries on the Rule of Saint Benedict. From the commentaries of Paul Warnefrid (c.770) and of Hildemar (c.845) information is obtained about the material organization of a monastery, the offices and duties of the monks, their studies and devotional practices. The whole treatment is quite objective: the "lights" and "shadows" of monastic life are well presented and exemplified.

This book should be read by everyone who has a special interest in medieval monasticism. The light it throws upon social, educational, and religious conditions makes it a useful volume for collateral reading in any history course which treats of the Carolingian period. The book contains a handy index and an excellent bibliography for the study of monasticism.

GEORGE M. PIEPER.

The Foreign Policy of Thomas F. Bayard, 1885-1897, by Charles Callan Tansill. New York. Fordham University Press. 1940. pp. xxxix + 800. \$5.00.

The dust jacket of this scholarly study of the foreign policy of Bayard gives the cue to its timeliness. Columbia and Britannia stand before a bust of the diplomat with wreaths of tribute in their hands, and beneath them runs the legend: "Let us not forget the man who did more than any other to bring us together. Time has justified him in the eyes of his countrymen." Today, when the two nations are linked more closely than ever before in their independent histories, a study of the life, opinions and policies of the man who did much, if not the most, to prepare the way for this rapprochement is indeed opportune. That time has justified Bayard's labors is too apparent for comment. One Democrat, Grover Cleveland, whose Secretary of State Bayard was, lost a presidential election partly because a vote for him was interpreted as a vote for Britain. Another Democrat, Franklin Roosevelt, won a precedent-smashing presidential election partly because a vote for him was interpreted by some as a vote for what they believed was "our first line of defense."

The present volume does not deal with the whole life of Thomas F. Bayard. His early years and his political career before his entry into the State Department are merely treated summarily as background, and attention is focused on those years indicated in the title. All of the major diplomatic issues of this period,—the questions concerning Samoa, the Fisheries, Hawaii, the Sackville-West incident, Korea, and the Venezuelan boundary dispute, which so nearly undid the work of Bayard, are discussed in the typically scholarly manner of Professor Tansill. This study is more than just a resumé of the diplomatic career of the Secretary of State and our first Ambassador to England. It also contains glimpses of the play and interplay of personal and party politics in this era of American "imperialism."

The volume contains no listed bibliography, but one may gather the sources from the numerous foot-note references. The format is attractive with original chapter headings in a script imitating Bayard's own handwriting.

MARTIN HASTING.

Wings of Eagles: The Jesuit Saints and Blessed, by Francis J. Corley and Robert J. Willmes. Milwaukee. Bruce Publishing Company. 1941. pp. 206. \$2.50.

Even in these days when historians claim for themselves a unique place among the world's great scholars, the "Jesuit enigma" frequently proves to be a veritable stumbling block for the best of them. Much has been written in defense of the Jesuits but often to no avail. As a last resort towards removing all suspicion and prejudice the reviewer recommends this volume. In *Wings of Eagles* the reader will find not "pious stories" nor even a formal defense of the Jesuits, but rather historically accurate accounts of men who represent in the concrete the true secret of the Society of Jesus. Every one of these men is either a saint or a blessed of the Catholic Church. There are scholars like Bellarmine and Canisius, missionaries and martyrs like Campion, Southwell and Jogues, the Company's founder, Ignatius, and leaders like Xavier and Francis Borgia, all of whom figure prominently in modern history. Besides these there were picked from thousands of Jesuits laboring for the Church during the past four-hundred years other men particularly eminent for their sanctity and zeal.

These narratives are original and accurate; the style is graphic and interesting. At the end of each account the reader will find a list of notable dates and references to other works on the same subject. The volume is the only complete collection of its kind in English. It will be of value to everyone interested in the Society of Jesus; friends will find the Jesuits at their best, and enemies will obtain an insight into her true spirit.

CHARLES J. MEHOK.

Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1939-1940. Quebec. Redempti Paradis. 1940.

M. Pierre-Georges Roy presents his twentieth *Rapport* with a very justifiable feeling of satisfaction. The veteran permits himself to muse on the peace and security of an archivist among his centuries-old documents, witnesses that "nearly always tell the truth," friends that make one forget the passing years, pleasant companions whose conversation carries one back to less troubled times "when people did not ask each evening: What will the morrow bring?"

The *Rapport* has three parts: the parochial census of Quebec for the year 1744, an inventory of documents touching the religious history of Canada, from 1610 to 1700 and a reprint of the correspondence of Governor de Vaudreuil with the French Court for the years 1707-1708. In an idle hour one might linger over the long list of unknowns with their ages and family connections. But the heart of the volume is the inventory, some thirty pages of it devoted to the heroic period before the arrival of the first bishop, seventy to Mgr. Laval and a hundred to the shorter rule of Saint Vallier. These documents have been widely used, and much of the material is already in printed form. M. l'abbé Ivanhoe Caron has provided references to publications in which the documents may be found. Any student of early Canada will be glad to have the complete inventory.

R. CORRIGAN.

In our next issue:

Hagia Sophia, by Emerson Howland Smith. New York. Columbia University Press. 1940. pp. xvii + 265 (46 pages of plates). \$10.00.

The subject and the author's treatment of it deserve more space than we can spare in this number of the BULLETIN.

Characters of the Inquisition, by William Thomas Walsh. New York. P. J. Kenedy. 1940. pp. xiv + 302. \$3.00.

ANNOUNCING

A SECOND EDITION OF

Faulkner's

AMERICAN POLITICAL AND SOCIAL HISTORY

will be published this month

Four chapters covering the period since 1920 have been completely revised and rewritten, and an important new chapter bringing the history down through the opening months of the third Roosevelt administration has been added. These, and minor changes throughout, make Faulkner the timely, dependable choice for summer school and fall classes.

Note also that

A WORKBOOK for the SECOND EDITION of AMERICAN POLITICAL and SOCIAL HISTORY

By R. L. BIESELE, University of Texas

will be ready for fall use

This workbook will contain a detailed outline with review questions and map exercises.

Book

Hyma Slosson

THE GROWTH OF EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION

This highly successful text for European civilization courses is brought up to date by a supplementary chapter, April 1941.

Up-to-date

Benns

EUROPE SINCE 1914 and EUROPEAN HISTORY SINCE 1870

The extensive 1940 supplement covering recent developments will be revised and incorporated in these standard texts for next year's use.

A REMINDER OF

Bailey's

A DIPLOMATIC HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

This complete story of American diplomacy from the beginnings to the present is "scholarly, thoughtful, and interesting," says Charles A. Beard.

F. S. CROFTS & CO. NEW YORK